United Nations S/PV.4254

Security Council

Distr.: General
11 January 2001

Original: English

Official communiqué of the 4254th meeting of the Security Council

Held in private in the Security Council Chamber at Headquarters, New York, on Thursday, 11 January 2001, at 10.30 a.m.

At its 4254th meeting, held in private on 11 January 2001, the Security Council considered the item entitled "The situation in Somalia".

In accordance with the understanding reached in the Council's prior consultations, His Excellency Mr. Ali Khalif Galaydh, Prime Minister of the Transitional National Government of Somalia, was invited to participate in the discussion.

The representative of Djibouti was invited, at his request, to participate in accordance with rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

The Security Council heard a briefing by His Excellency Mr. Ali Khalif Galaydh.

The members of the Council made comments and posed questions in connection with the briefing.

Prime Minister Galaydh responded to the comments and questions posed by members of the Council.

01-20938 (E) 110101

United Nations S/PV.4255

Security Council

Fifty-sixth year

Provisional

4255th meeting

Thursday, 11 January 2001, 5.05 p.m.

New York

President:	Mr. Mahbubani	(Singapore)
Members:	Bangladesh	Mr. Ahsan
	China	Mr. Wang Donghua
	Colombia	Mr. Ocaziones
	France	Mr. Teixeira da Silva
	Ireland	Mr. Cooney
	Jamaica	Miss Durrant
	Mali	Mr. Keita
	Mauritius	Mr. Neewoor
	Norway	Mr. Kolby
	Russian Federation	Mr. Sergeev
	Tunisia	Miss Achouri
	Ukraine	Mr. Kroklimal
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Mr. Ross
	United States of America	Mr. Stoffer

Agenda

The situation in Somalia

Report of the Secretary-General on the situation in Somalia (S/2000/1211).

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-178.

01-20956 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 5.05 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in Somalia

Report of the Secretary-General on the situation in Somalia (S/2000/1211)

The President: The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda. The Security Council is meeting in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations.

Members of the Council have before them the report of the Secretary-General on the situation in Somalia, document S/2000/1211.

Following consultations among members of the Security Council, I have been authorized to make the following statement on behalf of the Council:

"The Security Council notes with appreciation the Secretary-General's report of 19 December 2000 on the situation in Somalia (S/2000/1211) and reaffirms its commitment to a comprehensive and lasting settlement of the situation in Somalia, consistent with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, bearing in mind respect for the sovereignty, territorial integrity, political independence and unity of Somalia.

"The Security Council welcomes and supports the outcome of the Arta peace conference, the establishment of the Transitional National Assembly and the Transitional National Government. It expresses gratitude for the efforts undertaken by the Government and people of Djibouti in convening the peace conference. Furthermore, it recognizes with appreciation the impetus provided to the process by the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD), including the mandate extended by the Ministerial meeting in Djibouti in March 2000.

"The Security Council further welcomes the efforts of the Transitional National Government to promote reconciliation within Somalia. It strongly urges all political groups in the country, in particular those which have remained outside the Arta peace process, to engage in peaceful and constructive dialogue with the Transitional National Government in order to promote national reconciliation and facilitate the democratic elections scheduled for 2003, as called for in the Transitional National Charter. It further calls upon all groups, in particular armed movements, to support and participate in the demobilization efforts undertaken by the Transitional National Government. It encourages the Transitional National Government to continue, in a spirit of constructive dialogue, the process of engaging all groups in the country, including in the north-eastern and north-western areas, with the view to preparing for the installation of permanent governance arrangements through the democratic process.

"The Security Council underlines the massive challenges facing Somalia with respect to reconstruction and development, and the immediate need for urgent assistance, particularly in the areas of demobilization (with special attention to measures to combat HIV/AIDS and other communicable diseases), disarmament and rehabilitation of basic infrastructure. It calls upon the United Nations, its Member States and specialized agencies, non-governmental organizations as well as the Bretton Woods institutions to assist in addressing these challenges.

"The Security Council, emphasizing the importance of respect for human rights and international humanitarian law, notes with concern that the humanitarian and security situation remains fragile in several parts of Somalia, including Mogadishu. It strongly condemns attacks by armed groups on civilians and humanitarian personnel and calls upon all Somalis to respect fully the security and safety of personnel of the United Nations and its specialized agencies, the International Committee of the Red Cross and of non-governmental organizations, and to guarantee their complete freedom of movement and safe access throughout Somalia.

"The Security Council reiterates to all States their obligation to comply with measures imposed by resolution 733 (1992) of 23 January 1992 and urges each State to take the necessary steps to ensure full implementation and

enforcement of the arms embargo. It strongly condemns the illegal supply of weapons to recipients in Somalia. It reiterates its call upon all States, the United Nations and other international organizations and entities to report to the Committee established by resolution 751 (1992) of 24 April 1992 information on possible violations of the arms embargo.

"The Security Council insists that all States should refrain from any military intervention in the internal situation in Somalia and that the territory of Somalia should not be used to undermine the stability in the subregion.

"The Security Council welcomes the Secretary-General's intention to put in place a trust fund for peace-building in Somalia. It notes that despite the recent positive developments in Somalia, the security situation in the country is still a cause for serious concern. The Security Council therefore invites the Secretary-General to prepare a proposal for a peace-building mission for Somalia. Such a proposal should, with specific attention to the security situation in the country, outline possible ways to advance the peace process further.

"The Security Council remains seized of the matter."

This statement will be issued as a document of the Security Council under the symbol S/PRST/2001/1.

The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda. The Security Council will remain seized of the matter.

The meeting rose at 5.15 p.m.

United Nations S/PV.4256

Security Council

Fifty-sixth year

Provisional

4256th meeting

Friday, 12 January 2001, 1.05 p.m.

New York

President:	Mr. Mahbubani	(Singapore)
Members:	Bangladesh	Mr. Amin
	China	Mr. Chen Xu
	Colombia	Mr. Franco
	France	Mr. Doutriaux
	Ireland	Mr. Ryan
	Jamaica	Miss Durrant
	Mali	Mr. Toure
	Mauritius	Mr. Neewoor
	Norway	Mr. Kolby
	Russian Federation	Mr. Granovsky
	Tunisia	Mr. Cherif
	Ukraine	Mr. Kuchynski
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Mr. Ross
	United States of America	Mr. Minton

Agenda

The situation in Croatia

Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Mission of Observers in Prevlaka (S/2000/1251).

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-178.

01-21101 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 1.05 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in Croatia

Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Mission of Observers in Prevlaka (S/2000/1251)

The President: I should like to inform the Council that I have received a letter from the representative of Croatia in which he requests to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite that representative to participate in the discussion, without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it was so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Šimonović (Croatia) took a seat at the Council table.

The President: The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda. The Council is meeting in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations.

Members of the Council have before them the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Mission of Observers in Prevlaka, document S/2000/1251.

Members of the Council also have before them document S/2001/34, which contains the text of a draft resolution prepared in the course of the Council's prior consultations.

I should like to draw the attention of the members of the Council to the following documents: S/2000/1235, letter dated 22 December 2000 from Yugoslavia addressed to the President of the Security Council; and S/2001/13, letter dated 5 January 2001 from Croatia addressed to the President of the Security Council.

It is my understanding that the Council is ready to proceed to the vote on the draft resolution (S/2001/34) before it. Unless I hear any objection, I shall put the draft resolution to the vote now.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour:

Bangladesh, China, Colombia, France, Ireland, Jamaica, Mali, Mauritius, Norway, Russian Federation, Singapore, Tunisia, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

The President: There were 15 votes in favour. The draft resolution has been adopted unanimously as resolution 1335 (2001).

The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.

United Nations S/PV.4257

Security Council

Fifty-sixth year

Provisional

4257th meeting

Tuesday, 16 January 2001, 10 a.m.

New York

President:	Mr. Jayakumar	(Singapore)
Members:	Bangladesh	Mr. Chowdhury
	China	Mr. Shen Guofang
	Colombia	Mr. Valdivieso
	France	Mr. Levitte
	Ireland	Mr. Ryan
	Jamaica	Miss Durrant
	Mali	Mr. Ouane
	Mauritius	Mr. Neewoor
	Norway	Mr. Kolby
	Russian Federation	Mr. Sergeev
	Tunisia	Mr. Ben Mustapha
	Ukraine	Mr. Kuchynski
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Sir Jeremy Greenstock
	United States of America	Mr. Cunningham

Agenda

Strengthening cooperation with troop-contributing countries

Letter dated 8 January 2001 from the Permanent Representative of Singapore to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General (S/2001/21).

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-178.

01-21419 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 10.20 a.m.

Expression of thanks to the outgoing members

The President: At the outset of this meeting, I should like to extend best wishes for the year 2001 to all Members of the United Nations. I should also like to express the Council's deep gratitude to the outgoing members of the Council for their important contributions to its work. The representatives of Argentina, Canada, Malaysia, Namibia and the Netherlands, all in an excellent manner, contributed their talents to the business of the Council during their term of membership.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Strengthening cooperation with troop-contributing countries

Letter dated 8 January 2001 from the Permanent Representative of Singapore to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General (S/2001/21)

The President: I should like to inform the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Argentina, Australia, Bulgaria, Canada, Egypt, Fiji, India, Japan, Jordan, Malaysia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nigeria, Pakistan, Poland, the Republic of Korea, Romania, Senegal, South Africa, Sweden and Zambia in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Listre (Argentina), Mr. Stuart (Australia), Mr. Sotirov (Bulgaria), Mr. Heinbecker (Canada), Mr. Bebars (Egypt), Mr. Naidu (Fiji), Mr. Sharma (India), Mr. Akasaka (Japan), Mr. Al-Hussein (Jordan), Mr. Abdul Khalid (Malaysia), Mr. Sharma (Nepal), Mr. Hughes (New Zealand), Mr. Apata (Nigeria), Mr. Chaudhry (Pakistan), Mr. Stańczyk (Poland), Mr. Sun Joun-yung (Republic of Korea), Mr. Ducaru (Romania), Mr. Ka (Senegal), Ms. Ndhlovu (South Africa), Mr. Schori (Sweden) and Mr. Musamchime (Zambia) took the seats reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

The President: The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda. The Council is meeting in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations.

Members of the Council have before them the letter dated 8 January 2001 from Singapore, document S/2001/21.

I am pleased to welcome participants to this open debate on the subject "Strengthening cooperation with troop-contributing countries" (TCCs). Before I throw the floor open, permit me to make a few introductory comments.

This topic is timely. We are witnessing another significant upsurge in peacekeeping operations. The success of peacekeeping operations depends on a healthy triangular relationship between the Security Council, the Secretariat and the TCCs. Recent events have shown that all is not well in this triangle. The weakest of these links are those with the TCCs. One key goal of this debate must be to lead to a healthy triangle with respect to all three links.

However, we must remind ourselves that this is not a new problem. After the disasters in Somalia and Bosnia, the Council did some soul-searching and produced two documents, S/PRST/1994/62 and S/PRST/1996/13. Unfortunately, despite these lessons learned, we have witnessed similar problems in Sierra Leone recently. Clearly, we need to find out what went wrong and how it can be set right. The report of the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations, or the Brahimi report, has already activated some action on the part of the Security Council and the Secretariat to strengthen consultations with the TCCs. However, more can and needs to be done. We have to go beyond closer consultations to strengthening cooperation between these three partners of peacekeeping.

That said, we do not expect to arrive at all of the answers today. Rather, we hope that today's discussions will be a useful start on the road towards resolving the problems related to this important issue. The Singapore delegation has circulated background papers, which can be found in document S/2001/21. This document

provides some background and also raises some questions that could be addressed. With the aim of stimulating good discussion, let me briefly mention some of the questions that we might wish to address in today's open debate.

First, what are the key problems in the relations between the TCCs and the Council and the Secretariat? Has the practice of meetings with the TCCs prior to the adoption of Council resolutions helped? How can we further improve the content and form of private meetings with TCCs to make them more interactive and productive?

Secondly, apart from meetings with TCCs, what other mechanisms and channels can be used to strengthen the link between the Security Council and TCCs in peacekeeping? Does the current corporate culture encourage sufficient interaction with TCCs?

Thirdly, how can the three crucial partners — the Security Council, the Secretariat and the TCCs — cooperate better to address the peacekeeping problems of this age: commitment gaps in the contribution of troops to all United Nations peacekeeping operations, the failures and shortcomings of United Nations peacekeeping operations and the problems concerning the safety and security of United Nations peacekeepers?

To ensure that the concerns of troop-contributing countries are fully addressed in this debate, the Council has agreed that we will begin this morning's deliberations by first listening to the TCCs, after the Deputy Secretary-General, Louise Fréchette, has spoken. The entire morning session has been set aside for the TCCs to present their views. Subsequently, at 3 p.m. sharp, when we reconvene, the members of the Security Council will share their views. We hope that they will also respond to some of the concerns and suggestions stated by the TCCs. Following them, we will hear the comments of those TCCs that were not able to speak in the morning session.

Finally, we do not at this stage have any preconceived notions of the outcome of this open debate. We invite the delegations to present their views and ideas and to share their experiences. It is hoped that as a result of this exercise, some concrete recommendations will emerge which can be followed up on. The goal must be to enhance the relationship between the TCCs, the Security Council and the Secretariat, and bring about a new spirit of cooperation among the three partners. If these recommendations are accepted, we could then consider whether the Council should formulate a resolution or presidential statement to adopt them.

I now give the floor to the Deputy Secretary-General.

The Deputy Secretary-General: Before I begin my address I would like to inform all present that we are trying to lower the temperature in this house. I think it is going to make our meetings much less pleasant if we do not manage to solve that problem. So we are working on it.

We meet today to address an issue of central importance to our efforts to reform and revitalize United Nations peacekeeping for a new era. This meeting reflects a recognition that without strong, close, and constructive cooperation among the Security Council, the Secretariat and the countries which supply the troops for our missions, we cannot expect to find success in this vital endeavour.

Over the past year the international community has shown renewed political will to act to prevent conflict through the instrument of peacekeeping. At the same time, our operations are being asked to discharge increasingly complex tasks, often in hostile environments. In this context, it is more important than ever that there be the closest possible cooperation among the key elements in the peacekeeping machinery.

In the General Assembly, in the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations and in the Security Council, the international community has repeatedly acknowledged the importance of a vibrant and vigorous partnership, grounded in an ongoing dialogue. Most recently, the need for partnership and close communication was stressed in the report of the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations. I hope that today's discussion can help us to identify ways to pursue this goal.

Much of the focus of today's discussion concerns the framework for consultation between the Security Council and troop-contributors. We all stand to gain from a clear understanding between those who prepare the mandates and those who execute them. Troop-contributors need to know clearly what Security Council members envision, and the Security Council members need to understand what troop-contributors

are prepared to do. While the process of consultation may be time-consuming and complex, it pays invaluable dividends — not only for the troop-contributing countries (TCCs) and the Council, but also for those vulnerable populations we are seeking to help.

A central aspect of this effort is to improve cooperation between TCCs, the Security Council and the Secretariat. This will help us address such problems as commitment gaps in the contributions of troops; failures or shortcomings in the operations; and problems concerning safety and security, as you, Mr. President, have mentioned. We in the Secretariat are committed to providing accurate and timely information to political decision-makers in the Security Council, proposing options for action, and assessing accurately the risks and costs of each of these options. At the same time, we must provide troop contributors with the information they need to decide whether they wish to participate in a particular operation, including the requirements and risks that are involved. With both groups of interlocutors, our contacts allow us to listen to and take account of their concerns, expectations and insights.

In this context, the Secretariat attaches the highest importance to providing frequent and comprehensive briefings to Member States. We hold consultations with Member States during the formulation and revision of concepts of operations and at times of crisis. With the recent increase in resources, the Department of Peacekeeping Operations will be able to make its senior staff available — including its military and civilian police experts — to provide even more frequent briefings. We look forward to exploring with Member States how these sessions can be improved so as to respond to their requirements as fully as possible.

In addition to its regular meetings with groups of troop contributors, the Secretariat stands ready to meet with the representatives of individual Member States at any time, upon request, to discuss any concerns relating to the field. Furthermore, the Secretariat has not hesitated to introduce innovations where this would be useful; one example was the meeting the Secretariat convened in August 2000 with chiefs of defence staff of those countries contributing to the United Nations Mission in Sierra Leone (UNAMSIL).

In addition to the imperative to improve consultations, the Panel on Peace Operations contains a number of practical recommendations that can help improve our cooperation with troop contributors. For example, the establishment of a stand-by list of military and civilian police specialists would accelerate the recruitment of mission staff, which could then help make use of the expertise of troop contributors early in the planning phase.

Strengthened stand-by arrangements could lead to further opportunities for training of all potential peacekeepers, resulting in turn in a more coherent and consistent approach. It could also allow many administrative issues to be resolved in advance, such as negotiations related to contingent-owned equipment. This would reduce the risk of misunderstandings, delays and frictions.

The strength and promise of peacekeeping lies in its collaborative nature. By consulting closely, by coordinating our responses and our actions and establishing a relationship of trust and confidence, we can fully exploit the potential of peacekeeping.

We welcome today's debate, which we hope will lay the groundwork for still-closer ties among the Security Council, troop contributors and the Secretariat.

The President: I thank the Deputy Secretary-General for her statement.

The next speaker on my list is the representative of Pakistan. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Chaudhry (Pakistan): I will speak on behalf of Ambassador Shamshad Ahmad, who had to leave for Pakistan on official business. He would have wanted to make these remarks himself, in view of his deep involvement with issues related to peacekeeping, and in particular the topic before the Council today.

We would like to begin by felicitating the delegations of Singapore, Colombia, Ireland, Mauritius and Norway on their non-permanent membership of the Security Council from 1 January this year. We are confident of the important contribution that they, as elected members, will make to the work of the Council. I would also like to express our deep appreciation to the outgoing non-permanent members of the Security Council — Argentina, Canada, Malaysia, Namibia and

the Netherlands — for the exemplary manner in which they discharged their responsibilities.

Mr. President, as you mentioned in your introductory statement, today's discussion is most timely. We can only agree with you that the success of peacekeeping operations depends on a healthy triangular relationship between the Security Council, the Secretariat and the troop-contributing countries (TCCs).

The strengthening of cooperation with TCCs is a topic which is fundamental to the goal of making United Nations peacekeeping more efficient and effective. Regular, meaningful and effective cooperation between TCCs, the Security Council and the Secretariat on all operational matters is an essential element of United Nations peacekeeping operations. We believe that, had this issue been addressed in the early 1990s, many of the setbacks suffered by United Nations peacekeeping operations could have been avoided. Had a proper mechanism for consulting TCCs been in place, some of the problems in Somalia could have been easily avoided. Had past consultations been more meaningful and effective, the tragedy in Srebrenica might never have happened.

The Security Council has been aware of this problem for quite some time and has made several attempts to deal with it. The Council established the process of TCC meetings, the guidelines for which were laid down in its two presidential statements — also referred to in your introductory statement, Mr. President — PRST/1994/62 and PRST/1996/13. These guidelines contained elements that could have helped in making the three-way dialogue more meaningful and effective. However, more often than not these guidelines have remained largely ignored. As a result, TCC meetings have become little more than ritualistic briefings by the Secretariat. These meetings are convened more out of form than out of purpose.

The Brahimi Panel report has correctly highlighted the need to strengthen and institutionalize the Council's cooperation and coordination with TCCs. In response to the recommendations of the Brahimi Panel report, the Council took a step in the right direction when it agreed in its resolution 1327 (2000) to strengthen the existing system of consultations through the holding of private meetings with TCCs in the presence of Secretariat representatives. While this resolution does hold the promise of a more formalized process of consultations, there are a number of aspects that still need discussion to make the consultation mechanism more effective and useful.

We believe the best way of achieving this is through the establishment of ad hoc subsidiary organs of the Council, as provided by Article 29 of the Charter. These subsidiary organs would be mission-specific and based around a "core group" of troop-contributing countries for each peacekeeping operation. The Secretary-General would identify the core group of TCCs for each peacekeeping operation, which would become operational at the conceptional phase of each operation.

Consultations with the core group should begin well in advance of the establishment of the operation and be factored into the drawing up of new mandates. This engagement should continue on a regular basis through the implementation phase. In particular, such consultations should be held when the Council is considering a change in the mandate of an operation, including the use of force, or renewal or completion of a mandate, or when there is a rapid deterioration of the situation on the ground, which threatens the safety and security of peacekeepers.

In putting forward this idea, my delegation would like to emphasize that our proposal is not aimed at supplanting the Charter role of the Security Council. The object of the proposal is merely to facilitate unity of purpose between the Security Council, the TCCs and the Secretariat on any given operation. The aim of such an exercise would be to help ensure that the mandates eventually decided upon are precise, credible and achievable, with clearly defined political objectives. The phenomenon of incremental reinterpretations of mandates and of "mission creep" needs to be avoided at all costs.

The Secretariat must also work closely with TCCs. It is our experience that too often the Secretariat does not speak with one voice. TCCs often end up getting mixed signals and mixed directions from the Secretariat simply because of communication and coordination problems within its various components. We hope that the new leadership of the Department of Peacekeeping Operations will look into this matter seriously and give it high priority in the upcoming comprehensive review of the Department.

The Secretariat must provide TCCs and Council members background and briefing materials, as well as

the agenda, well in advance of meetings, unlike the present practice. Similarly, the date and venue should be, as far as circumstances allow, announced in the *Journal* of the United Nations several days before the event.

The quality of consultations would depend on the quality and the accuracy of information and assessments that are provided by the Secretariat. As past experience has shown, there can be neither efficient planning nor clear and credible mandates if these are inefficient or partial assessments. Sierra Leone is a case in point. Both the Department of Political Affairs and the Department of Peacekeeping Operations have crucial responsibilities to bear in this regard.

It is said that hindsight is 20/20. If there is one lesson that we have learned from the tragedies of recent ill-fated peacekeeping operations, it is that there must be more coordination within the United Nations system in carrying out such operations. Therefore, the strengthening of cooperation and coordination between the three pillars of United Nations peacekeeping — the Security Council, the TCCs and the United Nations Secretariat — cannot be emphasized enough.

In conclusion, I would like to say that we are particularly pleased to note that today's deliberations of the Council, under Singapore's presidency, allow non-members of the Council to express their views prior to Council members, breaking from past practice. As a result, we hope that opinions presented by non-members today will not only be heard, but also be taken into consideration by the Council during its future deliberations on an issue of such great importance to the whole membership.

The President: The next speaker inscribed on my list is the representative of Jordan. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Al-Hussein (Jordan): I would first like to congratulate you, Mr. President, and all the new members of the Security Council on the assumption of your duties. We are, of course, grateful to you, Mr. President, and to the members for the gracious gesture of allowing non-members to take the floor first on this subject, and my delegation thanks you warmly for it. I would also like to offer our appreciation to Ambassador Lavrov for the dedicated manner in which he handled the Council's affairs during the month of December.

I anticipate that a number of delegations will, during the course of the day, have us believe that the thematic debate is largely redundant, in view of the comprehensive discussions that flowed from the development of the mandate of the United Nations Mission in Sierra Leone mandate in September 2000 and the issuance of the Brahimi Panel report. It will probably be said that we have spoken enough; what remains now is for us to implement Security Council resolution 1327 (2000) and General Assembly resolution 55/135.

My delegation would agree absolutely on the need for the speedy implementation of the two resolutions. However, we would also join you, Mr. President, in seeing a need to review the topic again, and we intend, with your kind permission, to make one observation and to follow it up with a proposal.

For lack of time, we will also restrict our comments to the relationship between the Council and the troop contributors, not because we deem the Secretariat's role here as unimportant — far from it — but because we believe that before we can formulate procedural mechanisms, we must first build some trust and understanding between the Member States of this Organization.

When we speak of strengthening cooperation between the Security Council and troop-contributing countries (TCCs), we assume that two distinct communities exist: the Council and the contributors; or, put another way, we suppose that members of the Council are themselves not the contributors of troops. Obviously, this is not the case when peacekeeping, whether conducted by the United Nations or any other organization, is viewed in general terms or when participation in it is examined through a long historical lens. It is well appreciated that almost all Council members have, at one stage or another, contributed very significantly to United Nations, as well as to other, peacekeeping operations on the ground.

When this assumption of there being two communities does have resonance, and it resonates strongly, is when specific United Nations peacekeeping operations mounted today are recognized as being exceptionally dangerous; that is, when the risk of death and injury to United Nations peacekeepers is higher than is normally the case. In almost all of these cases it is also now widely accepted that United Nations battalions, and not monitors or specialists alone, should

be part of the mission's operational tapestry if the United Nations is to accord some sense of security and stability to the country or region under consideration.

If United Nations peacekeeping is examined today in broad statistical terms, we see the following. By the end of the year 2000, and specifically in November 2000, out of 189 Members of the United Nations, less than half — 88 to be exact — were contributors, including 14 members of the Security Council. Twenty-seven countries were contributors of formed units, including nine members of the Security Council, and by formed units I mean anything from platoon up; and out of 189 Member States, 22 supplied the United Nations with battalions, but only two of them were Council members.

So our discussion today, focusing as it does on the relationship between the Council and troop contributors, makes sense only in the context of dangerous operations, requiring in most instances the injection of United Nations battalions to provide a more secure environment. Now, of course, we recognize that some members of the Council have never shirked the responsibility of sending their battalions into harm's way in the service of the United Nations. Nevertheless, the distribution of the risk burden is still very uneven. With a small number of Member States outside the Council shouldering the lion's share of risk, one cannot but feel there is something desperately wrong and immoral about all of this.

Over the last decade, Jordan has consistently been one of the largest contributors to United Nations peacekeeping, having dispatched fully equipped battalions that are self-sustaining to some of the most dangerous and unforgiving areas of conflict, and we have suffered our fair share of casualties; and yet we are one of the smaller and poorer countries in the world, still owed millions of United States dollars by the United Nations for both current operations and operations that have long ceased to exist.

My delegation does not intend to elicit any sympathy or be boastful about this. It would be improper for me to do so given the enormous sacrifices made by other Member States speaking here today. But while we are prepared to serve with others, anywhere and everywhere, we are not prepared to be the servants of others, obeying blindly, unquestioning.

The preferred solution to the problem before us is not one of strengthening cooperation between the Council and the troop contributors in a manner that only reinforces the status quo — that is, the existence of two communities — but, as Bangladesh has argued recently, of assuring ourselves that a respectable number of those serving on the Council themselves become troop contributors when the Council mandates the more dangerous United Nations-run peacekeeping operations. It almost goes without saying that the price of privilege — the privilege of serving on the Council, the privilege of acting on behalf of the rest of us non-members in matters relating to international peace and security — should include the sharing of risk in the field.

We therefore appeal most respectfully to the members of the Security Council that, when considering a difficult mandate for prospective United Nations peacekeepers, they lead us by example, and be first in line to offer troops. With that, you can be assured, Mr. President, a great many of us will be sure to follow. Not only would our Secretary-General then surmount his current problem of finding the required number of peacekeepers for the more dangerous missions, but the neat and clear-cut distinction between Council and troop contributors would happily fade into irrelevance.

Until we reach this preferred situation, my delegation will continue to be realistic, though. We will continue to defend strongly the position long held by the Non-Aligned Movement on the need for more effective, institutional consultations between the Security Council and the TCCs. In this regard, we believe the responsibility for the creation of a more meaningful partnership lies principally with whomsoever holds the presidency of the Council and rests on the execution of sheer common sense.

Ultimately, we consider the forging of such a relationship important only insofar as it is a temporary measure until we reach a point when, one day, many more of us will be willing to share the risks of deploying United Nations troops into an uncertain environment.

We propose that, in one year's time, the then President of the Council consider the possibility of holding of a second open meeting on this subject, to gauge how successful we have been in fulfilment of these aims.

The President: The next speaker inscribed on my list is the representative of India. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Sharma (India): Mr. President, it is a great pleasure to see you presiding in the very first month of Singapore's current tenure on the Security Council. This is truly a remarkable inauguration of Singapore's service on the Council. Your wisdom in identifying the topic of strengthening co-operation with troop-contributing countries (TCCs) has also come not a day too soon, as troop contributors have been assisting the Council in this key activity of the United Nations for over half a century. We have the hope that this excellent initiative of Singapore in holding an open debate will be the harbinger of a new culture of mutually constructive association and interaction between troop contributors and the Council, which has been prominent by its absence. We commend you for identifying this pivotal theme, centrally related to the Council's work, on which a debate could have been held much earlier, in preference to some others we have seen here.

In its last presidential statement on enhancing consultations with TCCs, in March 1996, the Council agreed to keep this issue under review and stood ready to consider further measures and new mechanisms to further enhance the arrangements in the light of experience. It has taken another major crisis in peacekeeping and a panel of external experts to remind the Council that all was not well with existing arrangements, even though this is a subject on which we have spoken repeatedly for the past few years in relevant bodies such as the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations, the Fourth Committee and the Open-ended Working Group on Security Council Reform.

The issue of meaningful consultations between troop contributors and the Council is not a question to be determined by preserving status or privilege, but by necessity. Troop-contributing countries put at risk the lives of their soldiers in the service of the United Nations, in upholding and preserving the cherished ideals of the Charter, strikingly more than do many members of the Council who hold primary responsibility in this regard. These members should at least take the lead in ensuring that troop contributors have an effective say in the conduct of peacekeeping operations.

The Brahimi Panel had made a specific proposal on strengthening consultations with TCCs in paragraph 61 of its report. Unfortunately, perhaps due to oversight, this recommendation did not find its way into the summary of recommendations of the report. The Council, which otherwise rushed to embrace the Panel's recommendations, found it expedient to ignore this recommendation in its resolution 1327 (2000) of 13 November 2000. Instead, it came up with an ingenious formula of an improved system of consultations with the TCCs by "significantly" strengthening the existing system of consultations by agreeing to the holding of private meetings.

Why should the laudable attempt to arrive at an appropriate mechanism of mutually advantageous communication between the troop contributors and the Council, of which the larger United Nations membership is entirely supportive, apparently be seen as root canal work by the Council, particularly when this is an obligation on the Council and not an indulgence by it?

The Council held its first such private meeting with the TCCs on the United Nations Mission in Sierra Leone (UNAMSIL) in early October last year, when faced with a crisis on the withdrawal of India and Jordan, the two leading contributors to UNAMSIL. This was a case of too little, too late. If experience is any guide, results in future with such an approach will be no better. We need to learn from experience so that errors of the past are not repeated and the lessons learned are given practical expression.

To illustrate the gulf between precept and practice, let us recall that on 7 September 2000 the Council, meeting at the level of heads of State and Government, solemnly declared in its resolution 1318 (2000) its determination to strengthen consultations with TCCs, and yet four days later it put out a draft resolution on UNAMSIL in blue, ambitiously expanding its tasks, impervious to the serious reservations expressed by two of the largest troop contributors to that mission, precipitating their withdrawal.

Indeed, even earlier in the spring, when these troop-contributing countries formally sought to participate in a meeting of the Council on UNAMSIL, they were denied the opportunity and not even shown the courtesy of being sent a written response. Those who actually contribute to the maintenance of

international peace and security through their participation in United Nations peacekeeping operations, as against those who are primarily responsible under the Charter to do so, should not be kept at arm's length, when they are the arm of the Council.

Let us for a moment consider what has transpired since the adoption of resolution 1327 (2000) on 13 November 2000. Last month, a meeting was called of the TCCs on UNAMSIL, just a day after the eighth report of the Secretary-General on the mission was issued. It was not surprising that, in spite of the briefing from the Secretariat, troop contributors were not in a position to contribute meaningfully to the discussions. Notwithstanding the presidential statements of 1994 and 1996, such meetings have indeed become pro forma and ritualistic and not an occasion for fruitful deliberations and enabling forming of shared perspectives, as they should be.

It is instructive to read the records of the Council's meetings in the early 1960s, when the first operation in the Congo was set up. That was a conflict within a State, with the regional Powers involved, mercenaries deployed, the United Nations invited in and then spurned by some of the parties to the conflict, a massive humanitarian and refugee crisis, a collapse of administration which the United Nations had to replace, a Security Council agonizing over whether it should mandate a Chapter VII operation, a Secretary-General and a mission blamed for not doing enough and the Secretary-General responding that the Council had not given him either the mandate or the means to do more — in other words, all the hallmarks of what is believed to be the new peacekeeping.

The significant difference was that all this was played out in open meetings of the Council, at which all countries with an interest, including the troop contributors, participated whenever they felt it was needed. At one stage, India had 6,000 of the 16,000 troops deployed and the Indian Defence Minister spoke more than once to the Council. Permanent Representative C.S. Jha spelt out, in words just as relevant today, why India wanted to be not only heard by the Council, but to have an influence on its decisions:

> "We cannot forget, nor should the Council forget, that at very great sacrifice we have involved ourselves in the Congo, and that involvement does not mean merely the discomfort, the inconveniences and sometimes the loss of life to our young men serving in the Congo. It has a deep connexion with the whole state of public opinion in our country and, ourselves being a democratic country, this naturally has a great influence on our Parliament and on our Government." (*S/PV.982, p. 7*)

Unfortunately, though the TCCs could speak far more often than they can now, their views on what needed to be done were ignored, with the same consequences then as now. As things started to go sour, more than half a dozen of the troop contributors withdrew from the Congo operation because they did not agree with the way it was being run by the Council and by the Secretariat. Nothing really has changed. The Council has to be aware at all times that it is acting on behalf of the membership and not to safeguard its own preferences.

The General Assembly and the Secretary-General used modalities in the Congo that might usefully be revived where needed. The Assembly set up a Conciliation Commission, to which it appointed mostly representatives from the TCCs, who were the only ones in close touch with ground realities and with all the parties to the conflict. The Secretary-General set up an Advisory Committee comprising TCCs to help him tackle the crisis. Groups of friends of the Secretary-General have sometimes been set up for later crises and have played a useful role. These are modalities worth considering by the General Assembly, which, under Article 11 of the Charter, retains a responsibility on these issues if the Council and the Secretariat do not take them up.

Drawing on our experience in peacekeeping from the Congo to Sierra Leone, I will make some recommendations on when and how there should be closer consultations between the Council, troop contributors and the Secretariat.

These consultations should start when the Council mandates an operation. By then, the Secretariat has decided which countries should be TCCs and it has a concept of operations. At that stage, there should be a meeting or meetings of the Council, the Secretariat and the potential troop contributors to explain in some detail what the scope of the tasks is, what the likely problems are, what the TCCs will be expected to provide and what to do. TCCs must commit themselves

to an agreed set of tasks with resources and problems identified, and establish that they have the means to discharge their obligations. This is the stage at which those who are considering participation can assess their readiness in terms of the challenge of the task.

Participants in these meetings should share operational information which some permanent members have and do provide on an ad hoc basis to some TCCs. This information is often invaluable in helping prepare for a difficult mission in unfamiliar terrain.

The meetings should introduce TCCs to Secretariat bodies that they do not interact with, but which are often prime movers in some operations. The Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs comes to mind, but there are others. The TCCs need to know what these bodies and agencies are doing in the mission area and what sort of support they expect from the military, and do their own assessment of whether this can be offered and at what cost, because quite often there is a tension involved between different areas of a peacekeeping operations work.

These meetings must in particular consider the concepts of operation, which may bear the stamp of concepts developed by military alliances proposing deployments and tasks that can be carried out by relatively small numbers of troops only if, as their national or alliance strategic doctrines also require, they have limitless mobility, seamless cooperation between units, interoperability of the most modern equipment and a range of force multipliers in close support. What the United Nations gets is the same plan, but only the small numbers. Staff officers from the developing countries that have to execute these plans in a peacekeeping operation can explain why they will not work, as they so often do not in practice.

There must be close consultations in the preparations for deployment. All responsible TCCs send a reconnaissance mission out to the area of operations before deploying their troops. This is a basic professional requirement, which any army foregoes at its peril. Amazingly, the United Nations refuses to fund these visits, though the benefits come to the operation. We recommend that, as a standard policy, the United Nations require all TCCs to mount these missions, which the Organization should pay for. On its return from the reconnaissance, the TCC team should come to New York to share its findings with the Department of Peacekeeping Operations and, if necessary, with the Security Council. Quite often, until a TCC with a professional army has sent out its team, no multidisciplinary military team will have gone over the ground to try to match a Council mandate with local realities. A professional reconnaissance team can give early warning of dangers and problems that might arise.

If a tripartite meeting between the Council, the Secretariat and other TCCs cannot be arranged, at the very least the Secretariat should record faithfully and circulate to all concerned what a reconnaissance team has returned with. Even if mandates are not changed, which would mean the Council's having to adopt a resolution, a faulty concept of operation or pattern of deployment must then be corrected. In Sierra Leone, for instance, a battalion was being split between two contiguous towns. This seemed logical, except that the plan had forgotten that there was a rather large river dividing them, without a bridge on it. These errors can be corrected early and quickly through professional reconnaissance and proper consultations.

Consultations must be immediate whenever there is a change of situation on the ground. TCCs are not only the first to know that things are going wrong; they also have the keenest interest in being told what the Council and the Secretariat have in mind, because it is their troops who will get the blame for failure or take the casualties. The Secretariat and the Council, as required, cannot evade the hard decisions needed. For instance, when a party to an agreement tests out the peacekeepers, when do they use force, and how much? It is known that *provocateurs* want to prove that the United Nations is taking sides and that the use of force by the United Nations might be taken as an excuse to resile from the agreement it is there to monitor. Throughout the crisis in Sierra Leone, TCCs were bedevilled with this problem. The Secretariat refused to take a decision, leaving it to the Mission leadership to exercise local judgement. This was foolish, since the consequences for failure were shared, reflecting at least as badly on the Council and the Secretariat and tarnishing the image of the United Nations as a whole. Collective decisions, not just consultations, are essential.

Consultations must be held with TCCs before the Council changes a mandate, which it is often tempted to do when things go wrong. TCCs are often the only ones that can properly advise if a change is needed, if

what the Council has in mind will make matters worse or better, if it can be done militarily with the resources available and, if it can, what the outcome is likely to be. The Secretariat may have this information too, relayed from the field, but be diffident about opposing powerful voices in the Council. On other occasions, when its own predilections may be shared by these members, the advice from the field is suppressed. It is the Council that must make the decisions, but its members would agree that they can only make informed decisions if they are given the information they need. As we discovered in Sierra Leone, most members of the Council were as clueless about what was going on there as any non-member; they were being persuaded to take decisions, which were faulty, essentially on trust. The TCCs could have told them, but the TCCs were kept away from them.

TCCs must know about, and accept in advance, material changes to the terms and conditions under which they committed their troops. This is obviously essential when there is a formal change from a Chapter VI to a Chapter VII mandate, but the Council tends to finesse this by laying down Chapter VII tasks under Chapter VI mandates. This collective agreement is essential for the United Nations because it must satisfy itself that troops trained and equipped to carry out a set of agreed tasks can in fact take on, and do well, a set of radically altered tasks. For the TCCs it is just as important, because their Governments and Parliaments want to know why their soldiers have been sent into situations not anticipated when the United Nations request for forces was accepted.

When force is authorized — and when things go wrong, this is the first instinct — the Council must implement Articles 43 and 44 of the Charter. As we have repeatedly pointed out, Article 44 stipulates that TCCs must participate in the Council's decisions, not just be consulted on them.

Consultations must be held before the Council changes the legal framework within which peacekeepers operate. In Sierra Leone a special court was set up, with an impact on the operation and dangerous new tasks on which TCCs were not consulted. Those consultations should be mandatory under the procedure I have spelled out. But as TCCs will now see, the Council is proposing that the statute of the Special Court should give it residual powers to try peacekeepers, although under the status-of-forces agreements under which TCCs send their troops abroad they enjoy complete immunity. The Council cannot bind them through decisions to which they are not a party, and which conflict with and undermine their agreements with the United Nations; if it does, traditional TCCs will find it difficult to continue to support the United Nations.

How are those consultations at various stages to be held? The Council is the master of its own procedures, but there are several possibilities, some of which are listed in the President's paper. Private meetings are welcome as an interim measure, but they cannot be a solution. Resolution 1327 (2000) seeks to formalize that practice, but we need to go beyond this. In particular, instead of resorting to ad hoc measures, a regular body should be created that comprises members of the Council and contributors of formed units to a particular mission, to interact on various aspects of the conduct of that particular operation.

In addition, I want to remind the Council that Article 47, paragraph 2, of the Charter, which set up the Military Staff Committee, stipulated that the Committee could include officers from any Member States

> "when the efficient discharge of the Committee's responsibilities requires the participation of that Member in its work."

Why not revive that Committee, which is moribund, give it the mandate to follow peacekeeping operations, and use it as the forum for consultations with TCCs on purely military aspects?

There are some other ways in which these consultations and the performance of peacekeeping operations can be improved. I will list three. It might be useful if Council missions to a peacekeeping operation, which are now quite common, took with them representatives of TCCs. Apart from boosting morale among the troops, it would ensure that, on return, there was a common understanding among both Council members and TCCs about what was conveyed to the mission by the troops on the ground. The practice, started in Sierra Leone, of meeting with TCCs before and after a Council mission should continue, though these meetings would now be much more in the way of joint preparations to consider the way forward.

The Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ) also undertakes its own field trips, sometimes to the site of peacekeeping

operations. It, too, should be encouraged to meet with TCCs before its trip, and brief them on return. The ACABQ looks at the seamy side of the United Nations life, and what it turns up is useful for all of us to know. Its published reports must necessarily be sanitized. An informal discussion with Council members and TCCs might be much more productive.

The Secretariat briefs donors on activities executed through trust funds in peacekeeping operations. Often, this is the most sensitive part of a peacekeeping mission, where conflicts of interest are the sharpest and where the most onerous duties are placed upon troops. Quite often, TCCs are not even aware that these are tasks that they have to do until their troops arrive in theatre. TCCs must be associated with these briefings to donors. As the Secretariat explains what has or can be done, TCCs can explain the operational, and sometimes the political, costs of what the donors propose.

Publicity is an area where most TCCs believe the Secretariat lets them down shamefully, and where much closer consultations are essential. The Secretariat believes that the United Nations needs to promote itself in the developed world, where the criticism comes from. The Secretariat has an obligation to do justice to the performance and accomplishments of TCCs where merited, if necessary through special media briefings. The media in developed countries are independently fed the spin desired by the interests of developed countries. The Council very rarely, except through the odd presidential statement to the press, refutes the often false criticism that operations endure. In a crisis there must be a way for the Council, the Secretariat and TCCs — perhaps through joint briefings preceded by consultations — to put out a common point of view.

The international media batten on the failures of an operation. They by and large ignore the successes unless they can be described as the developed world riding again to the rescue of an inept developing world. It would be good if the United Nations would do a bit more than it does now to project the success stories of peacekeeping operations, both to the developed world and in the developing world, from where it gets its peacekeepers. That might make TCCs feel more appreciated and encourage their Governments to continue to be responsive to the United Nations requests for their support.

Some of the other important issues raised in the paper circulated by the President are the commitment gaps in the contribution of troops to United Nations peacekeeping operations, the previous failures and shortcomings of such operations and the problems concerning the safety and security of United Nations peacekeepers. On the issue of commitment gaps, the Brahimi Panel notes that in the last few years 77 per cent of the troops in formed military units deployed in United Nations peacekeeping operations were contributed by developing countries. This is a sad commentary on the willingness of others to share in the collective responsibility of maintaining international peace and security, and especially on those who believe they carry the primary responsibility in this regard as enshrined in Article 24 of the Charter.

Volumes can be written on the previous failures and shortcomings of United Nations peacekeeping operations. However, even a cursory reading of the Rwanda and Srebrenica reports, and that of the Eisele assessment team that visited Sierra Leone last year, is revealing. I have had occasion to address this issue in my statement on peacekeeping before the Fourth Committee on 9 November, as well as before the Council on 15 November last year during the open debate on the subject of "No exit without strategy". The lack of political will, an unrepresentative Council distanced from ground realities when mandating peacekeeping operations without taking the views of troop-contributing countries into account, unwise reliance on regional solutions, a commitment gap resulting in the United Nations accepting inadequate units as a matter of political expediency, and a financially burdened Organization trying to overreach itself are, in summary, the crux of the problems confronting United Nations peacekeeping.

The safety and security of United Nations peacekeepers is an issue of crucial importance to all, particularly to troop contributing countries. More than 100 Indian peacekeepers have made the ultimate sacrifice in the service of the United Nations.

Troop contributors deploy their personnel in peacekeeping missions aware of the risks involved. But it is our bounden duty to ensure the safety and security of our peacekeepers, and we should leave no stone unturned in this regard. The best insurance against such risks is a properly planned and mandated mission, comprising well-trained, equipped and disciplined contingents that are not deployed in a void in which the

political process is either non-existent or compromised for lesser interests, expressing the priorities of a few.

These problems can be tackled comprehensively only through a sustained and meaningful dialogue amongst the principal actors — the Council, the TCCs and the Secretariat. An institutionalized mechanism, comprising the main players, would provide an appropriate forum to seriously address these issues.

We are confident that under your active leadership the Council will not merely listen to the views that are being expressed by troop contributors today, but will seriously consider them in formulating a thought-through and result-seeking approach in addressing some of the most glaring lacunae in the way this Organization conducts peacekeeping operations.

The President: The next speaker is the representative of the Republic of Korea. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Sun Joun-yung (Republic of Korea): I would like to start by welcoming you, Minister Jayakumar, and congratulate Singapore for assuming this year's first turn of the presidency. Taking this opportunity, I also extend my delegation's congratulations to the other new members of the Council — namely, Colombia, Ireland, Mauritius and Norway. I firmly believe that they will make fresh contributions to the work of the Council.

The Republic of Korea has always been a strong advocate for strengthening the cooperation between the Council and troop-contributing countries (TCCs), both as a troop-contributing country itself and as a strong supporter of the reform process aimed at a more transparent and accountable Security Council. Currently we are witnessing a resurgence of United Nations peacekeeping operations, in which the role of the TCCs is increasingly gaining importance. Within this context, strengthened cooperation between the Council, the TCCs and the Secretariat will be an important platform from which to strengthen the effectiveness of peacekeeping operations.

In this regard, my delegation particularly appreciates Singapore's initiative in tabling this important agenda item before us today. Today's debate is all the more timely considering the strong political will to enhance United Nations peacekeeping activities that was manifested on the occasion of the Millennium Summit, the submission of the Brahimi report and the subsequent efforts of the Security Council working group and of the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations to review the report.

Against this backdrop my delegation wishes to comment on some of the issues to which it attaches particular importance.

When compared to the past, peacekeeping operations have changed not only in size and scope, but also in nature. As in the cases of the United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK) and the United Nations Transitional Administration in East Timor (UNTAET), the character and mandate of the peacekeeping missions are evolving in order to adapt to the nature of crises and the current reality. More recently, the experience in Sierra Leone eloquently demonstrated the urgent need to upgrade th level of consultations with TCCs. Such developments call for a qualitative improvement in cooperation and coordination between the Council and TCCs.

It is our belief that the TCCs are still largely alienated from important stages of the decision-making processes. Despite their contribution of soldiers, equipment and much-needed resources, TCCs are offered limited chances to voice their concerns over important matters that directly affect the lives of their nationals and their contributions.

Hence, my delegation fully acknowledges the efforts of the Security Council, which in its resolution 1327 (2000) of 13 November 2000 underlined the importance of an improved system of consultations with TCCs and agreed to strengthen significantly the existing system of consultations. We also welcome the increasing recognition by the Council of the merits of interacting more frequently with TCCs. And yet, what matters is not the number of times TCCs are briefed or allowed to speak in the Council, but the degree to which they can substantially contribute to the decision-making process of peacekeeping operations.

Although we appreciate the efforts made by the Council and the Secretariat to continuously update TCCs on the current status of field missions, our own experience dictates that there is still room for the current TCC meetings to become more effective and interactive. TCC meetings should be more than a mere forum for TCCs to be briefed on past occurrences in the field. If, for instance, a structural change, downsizing or expansion of a peacekeeping operation

is expected, the Council should provide the relevant TCCs with the plan under consideration in a timely manner, to enable TCCs to prepare well in advance.

In this context, a more institutionalized mechanism should be considered to allow for genuine participation by TCCs. While fully acknowledging that peacekeeping missions are established by the sole authority of the Security Council, my delegation believes that the creation of such a mechanism would be a meaningful step towards enhancing the overall capabilities of peacekeeping operations.

We also believe that the Council and the Secretary-General can collaborate more closely in the initial stage of planning in finding ways to provide prospective troop contributors with opportunities to participate. The enhancement of early-stage consultations will undoubtedly help remedy the commitment gaps as well as minimize failures.

The Brahimi report contains a number of useful recommendations and also covers the issue of cooperation with TCCs. My delegation believes that the impact of the report and the subsequent discussion it generated should be maintained and furthered. In this regard, we support the idea of establishing a subsidiary organ of the Council in an appropriate form, as provided for in Article 29 of the Charter. We also take note that the Secretary-General, in his report on the implementation of the Brahimi report, wholeheartedly concurred with the Panel's assessment that closer consultation between TCCs and the Security Council, including through a new mechanism, is needed.

The Republic of Korea is currently contributing 476 peacekeepers to various peacekeeping operation missions. My Government expects that its contribution to peacekeeping activities will become more substantial as its experiences grow. In financial terms, as a result of the recent agreement on the scale of assessments, Korea's increase in contribution in the coming years will be one of the largest among Member States.

My delegation reiterates its belief that the views of the Member States that are willing and able to contribute to peacekeeping should be respected and accommodated by the Council through the institutionalization of a consultation mechanism.

Several years have passed since the idea of the establishment of new mechanisms for strengthening cooperation between the Council and TCCs was introduced. The time has come for the Council to consider appropriate actions without further delay.

The President: The next speaker inscribed on my list is the representative of Japan. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Satoh (Japan): At the outset, I would like to express my sincere appreciation to you, Mr. President, for your leadership in initiating and convening this open meeting of the Council. I would also like to take this opportunity to congratulate Singapore and the other new members, namely Colombia, Ireland, Mauritius and Norway, on joining the Council. We are convinced that each of the new members will make a great contribution to the activities of this important Organization by providing it with fresh thoughts and perspectives.

Japan has been strongly committed to, and actively engaged in, efforts to strengthen the cooperation between the Security Council and troop-contributing countries, with the involvement of the Secretariat. For example, when Japan occupied the presidency of the Security Council in April 1998, it was instrumental in setting a precedent for convening a meeting of the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations with the President of the Council, to discuss ways to improve the meeting of the troop-contributing countries.

Today I would like to focus on one new aspect of this long-debated and complex issue: that is, the need to broaden the scope of participants in consultations between the Security Council and troop contributors. I want to hasten to add here that it is crucially important for the Council to listen to the views of the countries that send their troops and police elements to the field.

As we all know, the maintenance of peace and security now requires a comprehensive approach, one that includes efforts in the economic, social and humanitarian areas on top of the traditional peacekeeping operations, which encompass military and police activities. This is reflected in the multifaceted mandates of recent peacekeeping operations, which often include tasks having to do with nation-building, governance and development. These large-scale, comprehensive missions tend to be funded by voluntary contributions by interested Member States, in addition to assessed contributions.

In such multifaceted operations, the civilian component is often substantial. A case in point is the United Nations Transitional Administration in East Timor (UNTAET), where a third of the military and civilian police personnel deployed in the operation are civilians.

It stands to reason that in such multifaceted operations, consultations between the Security Council and contributing countries should not be limited to those countries providing military and civilian police personnel. Rather, they should be open to those countries that provide civilian personnel; countries whose nationals are engaged in humanitarian activities on the margins of the operation; countries that have made major financial contributions or provided key elements or expertise; and countries that are particularly knowledgeable about the situation on the ground.

These countries have a great deal at stake in the conduct and outcome of peacekeeping operations. The safety and security of personnel is of no less serious concern to the countries that have provided civilian personnel than it is to those that have provided military personnel. Countries that have made major financial contributions to the operations are held accountable by their taxpayers. Indeed, because today's operations are increasingly linked to the post-conflict peace-building agenda such as nation-building and development, peacekeeping operations themselves will be strengthened if all major contributing countries participate in the consultations with the Security Council.

This need to include non-troop-contributing countries in Security Council consultations is reflected in previous statements and notes of the President of the Council, such as S/1998/1016 and S/PRST/1996/13. Japan, for one, strongly believes that it is important to stress this need again in our deliberations today on strengthening the cooperation between the Council and troop-contributing countries.

The President: The next speaker inscribed on my list is the representative of Australia. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Stuart (Australia): Allow me to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council. Australia looks forward to working closely with Singapore and, indeed, with the other new members of the Council that have begun their terms this month.

We welcome in particular the opportunity to contribute to this debate and commend Singapore's initiative in convening it. The issue of strengthening cooperation with troop-contributing countries is an important one for all Member States and a key element in improving the overall effectiveness of United Nations peacekeeping.

The need to consult with contributors or potential contributors of troops to United Nations operations was recognized in the Charter. Over the last decade or so, the growing demands and complexity of such operations has led Member States to give more attention to improving consultation between the Council and troop contributors. The Council's track record in this area has, however, been a mixed one. It was therefore a welcome development when the Brahimi report on United Nations peace operations gave renewed emphasis to the importance of timely and effective consultation with troop contributors.

This has also been a prominent theme of the reports of the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations in recent years, including its report to the General Assembly of 4 December on the Brahimi report. Indeed, during the course of the Special Committee's deliberations at its extraordinary session last year, there was probably no other issue that enjoyed such strong and broad support.

There is a direct correlation between the willingness of the Security Council and the Secretariat to share information and their thinking with troop contributors, and the degree of confidence that Governments have in the concept of operations, planning and management of proposed peacekeeping missions. This should not lead us to assume that an improvement in the frequency and quality of consultation with Member States will necessarily translate into an increase in participation rates in peacekeeping operations. Governments will always make decisions to participate, or not to participate, on the basis of a number of considerations, and there will continue to be operations where the perceived level of risk or other factors will deter some from contributing troops.

That being said, the absence of effective consultation will almost certainly result in potential contributors turning away because of lack of

information or lack of opportunity to contribute to the development of a concept of operations or a Council mandate. This can serve only to complicate the task of both the Council and commanders in the field.

We see two essential elements to more effective consultation and cooperation with troop contributors: two-way communication and timeliness. Meaningful consultations require active listening by all parties. It is not sufficient to go through the motions of a consultative process that amounts to little more than troop contributors being informed of Secretariat planning or the Council's position. All parties stand to gain from an effective two-way dialogue, not least Council members and military planners in the Secretariat who can benefit from the input of Member States, which will not only have legitimate concerns as troop contributors, but in many cases also have expertise in the theatre of operation that can greatly assist the planning process.

The timing of consultations is critical. Prior consultations should be regarded as indispensable in situations where the Council is changing the status of an existing operation or amending rules of engagement. Failing to consult Governments that have troops on the ground in such circumstances would be, in effect, a breach of faith. Consultations should also precede the establishment of a mandate — in that case, involving potential troop contributors — and consultations should be a part of the process of developing and refining the concept of operation for a mission.

We recognize that the Council often faces pressures to make speedy decisions and must balance a range of conflicting considerations and national positions. In looking at ways to strengthen the consultation process, we do not advocate burdensome processes or structures that would undercut the Council's ability to make effective and timely decisions.

Finding the right balance presents a challenge — for the Council, the Secretariat and Member States — which will require that all parties approach consultations in a constructive way. On the one hand, if the Council hosts consultations which do no more than present troop-contributing countries with faits accomplis, the process will be undermined; on the other hand, if troop contributors were to use the process cynically or were to hold up decision-making without regard to broader interests, this would also do peacekeeping a disservice. It is crucial, therefore, that all parties concerned approach the consultation process in a cooperative spirit.

It would be remiss not to acknowledge that some improvements have been made over the years. We commend in particular the effort of the Department of Peacekeeping Operations to enhance the frequency and the quality of its consultations with troop contributors, including the recent initiative to issue briefing notes when the issues are complex or unfamiliar. These have been worthwhile steps in the right direction.

We again thank you, Mr. President, and the delegation of Singapore for initiating debate on this important topic, and we look forward to contributing to further work on it.

The President: The next speaker inscribed on my list is the representative of Fiji. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Naidu (Fiji): Allow me to warmly congratulate you, Mr. President, on your election to the Council and your assumption of the presidency during the first month of your membership. I would also like to take this opportunity to warmly congratulate Colombia, Ireland, Mauritius and Norway on their election to the Council.

The Government of Fiji takes heart from this open debate as the event that may consolidate past reflections and initiatives on how to rejuvenate United Nations peacekeeping operations 23 years after their inception. Belying its smallness and modest resources, Fiji has been a troop contributor throughout this period — in military and civilian police operations in the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL), the United Nations Iraq-Kuwait Observation Mission (UNIKOM), the United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK), the United Nations Mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina (UNMIBH), the United Nations Mission of Observers in Tajikistan (UNMOT) and, most recently, in the United Nations Transitional Administration in East Timor (UNTAET). Fiji has also served in other non-United Nations missions, including in the Sinai, in Bougainville and in Rhodesia. The total strength of Fiji contingents serving in all these missions numbers close to 900 at the present time. Fiji's broad-based experience, as I have listed, includes personnel serving at all levels in peacekeeping activities — field and force commanders, as well as soldiers and officers.

The initiative of the Singapore Mission in bringing about this debate during its term of presidency on the Security Council enables my Government to participate and share its concerns and thoughts on this vital United Nations responsibility and obligation for global peace and security.

Fiji also acknowledges and endorses the various initiatives taken in Security Council presidential statements 1994/62 and 1996/13, the far-reaching findings of the Brahimi Panel report and Security Council resolution 1327 (2000).

Fiji specifically commends the Secretary-General's personal role in and attendance at the recent signing of the memorandum of understanding between Ethiopia and Eritrea. That defining event signals a welcome attitudinal and institutional change in the modus operandi of peacekeeping operations.

On the other hand, Fiji's experience in UNIFIL was quite different, as, indeed, were other missions in which Fiji was not involved; they were fraught with danger and frustrations for all troop-contributing countries (TCCs) due to the lack of a formal peace agreement between the warring parties. The evident lack of political will to prevail upon all parties concerned to honour the terms of the UNIFIL mandate precipitated that situation. Inevitably, some contingents withdrew. The security zone in southern Lebanon endured protracted occupation until June 2000, and UNIFIL's ability to function effectively in its area of operations was severely undermined. Regrettably for TCCs, throughout such difficulties there is no available mechanism through which to air and channel misgivings or concerns.

We do not wish to belabour the issue in detail at this stage, but would simply like to seize this opportunity, as a small developing TCC, to call for improved cooperation and greater consultation between the Security Council, the Secretariat and the troop-contributing countries, with a view to strengthening peacekeeping operations. In our genuine desire to be team players, we are fully confident that our peacekeeping experiences, losses and gains can legitimately inform us in this process.

Fiji has frequently noted its heavy human losses in peacekeeping operations, now numbering 37. UNIFIL alone has consumed at least 250 lives of service personnel in its 23 years of operation. This is an unacceptable casualty figure in peacekeeping terms. In whatever mission, it remains important that warring parties are held accountable for such casualties.

Through the United Nations Tribunals and internationally recognized courts, including the new International Criminal Court when it is formally instituted, Fiji is confident that the loss of lives in all peacekeeping missions can be minimized and those responsible properly brought to justice. This will give credibility to the international mechanisms that are put in place for these specific objectives to strengthen peacekeeping operations and deter would-be violators of operations mandated by the Security Council.

Strengthened peacekeeping also presupposes the legal obligation of a host country, on whose invitation United Nations intervention was provided, to resolve or manage conflict, to assist the United Nations peacekeeping operation and to honour such a commitment for the continuation of the operation in its territory. A lapse in this commitment should automatically lead to the non-renewal of the force mandate or to the withdrawal of a mission.

My Government has also pondered seriously the reimbursement procedures, which weigh heavily against us in causing severe budgetary constraints. Analysing the disadvantages of the present procedure and finding constructive remedies thereto are critical steps to strengthening peacekeeping operations. We endure counter-productive lags under this reimbursement system. The system diminishes the ability of Governments such as my own to commit their finances towards areas of greater need for effective discharge of these operations.

For Fiji, acquisition of appropriate armoury to adequately equip our troops for the missions is a strain. A more viable option is for the United Nations to procure armoury through the tendering and bulk purchasing scheme at a more reasonable cost than that which individual troop contributing countries (TCCs) like my own presently endure. This would considerably ease the responsibilities of TCCs while standardizing the required equipment levels at each mission.

Strengthened peacekeeping demands that we go beyond closer consultations between TCCs, the Security Council and the Secretariat. Consultations must be in good time. Meetings must also of necessity be interactive and productive, with the capacity to regularly monitor and review reports on various missions for Security Council members, non-members

and TCCs alike. It is important to institutionalize this consultation mechanism.

To achieve this objective, we must realize the challenge of the Brahimi recommendation for the convening of a Security Council special sub-committee to take up some of the professional and detail points with which technocrats and strategists can best equip us. Only then can a decision be taken whether to deploy, renew or withdraw a mission or merely to amend the relevant mandate. All linkages can thus be maintained and overhauled to adopt a realistic process that is based on an objective assessment of the actual situations on the ground.

The President: The next speaker inscribed on my list is the representative of South Africa. I invite her to take a seat at the Council table and to make her statement.

Ms. Ndhlovu (South Africa): May I begin by congratulating Singapore on assuming the presidency of the Security Council. I also extend my delegation's congratulations to the other new members of the Council.

My delegation also wishes to commend you, Mr. President, for preparing an excellent discussion paper, which certainly highlights the most important aspects requiring our ongoing focus and attention.

Part of the problem that has beset United Nations peacekeeping in the last few years, and most recently demonstrated by events in Sierra Leone, has been the lack of coordination between key role-players. My delegation has therefore welcomed the Brahimi report's recommendations, which focused on this particular problem. In light of recent discussions among Member States on the Brahimi report, the debate on this theme could not have come at a more opportune time.

Meaningful consultations between the Council, troop-contributing countries (TCCs) and the Secretariat form an important part of coordination and cooperation, which are an essential requirement for the successful implementation of peacekeeping mandates and the overall efforts to improve United Nations peacekeeping. South Africa's policy of participation in peace missions identifies the need for consultations on peacekeeping mandates as an important determining factor for our effective participation in peacekeeping operations. Consequently, my delegation has, on various occasions, underlined the need for the creation of a system of more meaningful consultations between TCCs and the Council during all phases of peacekeeping operations, from conceptualization to termination.

My delegation was therefore pleased to note the adoption of resolution 1327 (2000) of 13 November 2000, in which the Council commits itself to significantly strengthen the existing system of consultations at the various phases of a peacekeeping operation. We are particularly pleased that the Council has acknowledged that consultations may now be initiated by troop contributors, because this increases the opportunities to hold such consultations. Furthermore, the recommendations of the Special Committee on this question certainly complement and build on the provisions of resolution 1327 (2000), and we hope that the Council will implement them. Of particular importance to us in this regard is the need to adhere to the provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter when the use of force is authorized by the Council.

You rightly point out, Mr. President, that the above-mentioned improvements to the system of consultations are part of an ongoing process which was initiated almost a decade ago. The practice has, however, almost never accorded with the spirit of the commitment to enhanced consultation. The momentum created by the Brahimi report thus needs to be sustained to ensure that consultations are not pseudo-consultations, but that they provide for real interaction. They must become the platform for a genuine exchange of views during which key role-players can express their concerns and interests. The quality aspect of consultations also places particular responsibility on the Secretariat to improve access to information in order to facilitate a free exchange of views between TCCs and the Council.

In the discussion paper, a pertinent issue is raised regarding the sufficiency of the current arrangements for consultations. My delegation believes that the Brahimi report's recommendation on subsidiary bodies, in accordance with Article 29 of the Charter of the United Nations, remains valid and should be pursued in the Council's efforts to continually improve the system of consultations.

In conclusion, I would like to reassure the Security Council that South Africa remains ready to participate in the promotion of peace and security

around the world. President Mbeki summed up South Africa's role in peacekeeping when he said:

> "Our men and women from our National Defence Force have been selected to serve with United Nations peacekeepers in the Congo, Ethiopia and Eritrea and may be called upon to assist in Sierra Leone. None of us will ever forget the extraordinary humanitarian work our Air Force did to rescue 15,000 flood-stricken Mozambicans. Many of us will not be aware of the subsequent work done by our Air Force to distribute ballot papers in Mozambique, as our contribution to that country's efforts to consolidate its democracy. We salute that distinguished South African, Nelson Mandela, who has spared no effort to bring about peace to the sister republic of Burundi and wish him success in his difficult task."

The President: Let me make a procedural announcement. We intend to suspend the morning session of this meeting at around 1 p.m. We hope that this will give sufficient time to Council members to reflect on the views expressed by the troop-contributing countries before they respond at 3 p.m. today. As I announced at the outset of today's meeting, after the Council members have spoken we will hear the views of other Member States that are inscribed to speak.

The next speaker inscribed on my list is the representative of Argentina. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Listre (Argentina) (*spoke in Spanish*): I wish to express my delegation's pleasure at seeing you, Sir, presiding over this debate. I congratulate your country for having raised this subject for discussion by the Security Council. I also take this opportunity to commend my friends, representatives in this Council, with whom I had the privilege to work when my country was a member of the Council until 31 December last year, and to welcome the new members who joined this year.

The need to strengthen cooperation with troop-contributing countries cannot be denied, since there are 16 peacekeeping operations and about 40,000 Blue Helmets deployed throughout the world. For Argentina, this issue is of special interest, not only because these operations are important to the Organization, but also because Argentina is the main troop contributor from Latin America and participates in 10 of the 16 operations I referred to, in the course of which it has lost 20 of its nationals. That is why, given the importance of this subject, in 1994, my country, as a member of the Security Council, together with New Zealand, gave impetus to the adoption of the presidential statement that formalized the consultation process among the Security Council, the Secretariat and troop-contributing countries.

In 1994 and later in 1996, with great effort, the criteria and framework to formalize a consultation process with troop contributors were determined. On this basis, the relationship was strengthened. Seven years later, however, we must recognize that many of the concerns then enunciated are still current. We feel that this is a problem not of principles, but of implementation. That is why we believe that many of those concerns could be solved in 2001 if the presidential statements were fully implemented. Let me mention some examples.

The 1994 statement stipulates that the meetings among the members of Security Council, troop-contributing countries and the Secretariat should be held well before the adoption by the Council of decisions on the extension, termination or modification of the mandate of a peacekeeping operation. In practice, during the two years we were members of the Council, we noted that those meetings were mostly held a few days before the adoption of the decision by the Council. Even on those occasions, the meeting was held when the negotiating process on the draft resolution had already begun or was at an advanced stage. All this sometimes helps to make those meetings a mere formality, obviating their main goal of alerting the Council in advance of the concerns, interests and potential limitations of the troop contributors, so that these may be taken into account when the decision is made.

Another stipulation is that meetings be held with special representatives of the Secretary-General and force commanders. In 1999 and 2000, such meetings were the exception, not the rule, in spite of the importance of receiving direct information from those who are in the field when, for instance, the modification of the mandate is foreseen.

One last example that we would like to cite is the possibility for other concerned countries also to participate in the meetings held with troop-contributing countries. We refer specifically to the operation's host

country and to the countries especially affected in the region where the operation takes place. On the basis of the circumstances of each particular case, we think that this alternative should be explored.

The essential question is: Why have these provisions either not been implemented or been implemented erratically and partially? There is probably more than one reason. Let me share some of them.

First, the members of the Council, especially the permanent members, may fear that their decision-making power will be weakened or that States that are not members of the Council will impose conditions on the implementation. Secondly, there may be an insufficiency of staff or resources in the Department of Peace-keeping Operations. Thirdly, some troop-contributing countries may not be interested in participating more actively in the meetings. In order to overcome those fears and weaknesses and to make the relationship among the Security Council, troop-contributing countries and the Secretariat genuinely fluid in practice, I would make the following observations.

There is no doubt that the Security Council has exclusive decision-making power. It is also true, however, that the Council's decisions directly affect troop contributors, since the risks of the operation fall mainly on their shoulders. The United Nations Mission in Sierra Leone is a clear example of this. In that case, the Council decided to change the mandate of the operation after its establishment and to place parts of the mandate under Chapter VII. There is therefore a duty to provide transparency and to apprise troop-contributing countries of all necessary aspects so that they can undertake an objective analysis of a situation and take their own decisions as to whether to participate or to withdraw their contingents.

That duty to provide transparency is not limited to giving information, but also includes being receptive to the opinions and concerns of contributors. Should the Council not act in that fashion, there would be a risk that it might adopt mandates that could not be carried out due to contributors' belief that those mandates cannot be implemented in practice.

The Secretariat must be able to rely on sufficient human and financial resources. This is also related to the need for the Secretariat to be able to rely on its own sources of information as much as possible; otherwise, there is a risk of communicating erroneous information and making inaccurate analyses.

It is important that troop-contributing countries appropriately follow up the development of a conflict and that they increase their participation in meetings so that such meetings can be interactive. Although such cases are very important, we do not believe that interest should be limited exclusively to cases in which the security of personnel has been violated — for instance, cases of the kidnapping of observers.

In conclusion, as we stated before the Council on 13 November 2000, at the time of the adoption of resolution 1327 (2000), on implementing the recommendations of the Brahimi report,

> "We are pleased that the Council recognizes the importance of improving the existing mechanism for consultations with the troop-contributing countries and is to implement specific proposals in this regard. The message to this group of countries must be clear. We need to maintain an open line of mutual communication and to have interactive meetings where their concerns and interests can be expressed. Strengthening the consultation process implies, on the one hand, facilitating access to consultations, and, on the other, increasing the number of opportunities to hold them." (*S/PV. 4220, p. 10*)

We made that statement because it would not be fair of us to fail to recognize that much has been done to strengthen cooperation among troop-contributing countries, the Security Council and the Secretariat, which are the three pillars of peacekeeping operations. However, there is still a long road ahead, one that will be easier if the Council has sufficient political will to make its decision-making process more transparent with regard to establishing, terminating or modifying the mandate of a peacekeeping operation.

The President: The next speaker inscribed on my list is the representative of Sweden. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Schori (Sweden): Mr. President, allow me to congratulate you, and Singapore, on your role in the presidency and on the initiative you have taken. I would also like to thank the other members of the Council for this opportunity for us to speak today.

I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union. The Central and Eastern European Countries associated with the European Union — Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia — as well as the associated countries of Cyprus and Malta align themselves with this statement.

The commitment of the European Union to the primary role of the United Nations in the maintenance of international peace and security, and to the core function of peacekeeping, is evident in the contributions of troops, police officers, military observers and civilian personnel from the member States of the European Union to United Nations peacekeeping operations. The European Union also supports the Standby Arrangement System as an essential element in strengthening the United Nations peacekeeping capacity. In addition, the Union has thousands of men and women assigned to United Nations-mandated operations in the Balkans, where the European Union is by far the most important troop contributor, with its contribution representing approximately 60 per cent of the international effort on the ground. The share of the European Union member States for the United Nations peacekeeping budget is almost 40 per cent. By paying their assessed contributions on time and in full, they play a decisive role in ensuring that peacekeeping activities continue functioning smoothly.

The crisis-management capacity of the European Union is rapidly developing. The goal is to contribute effectively to the prevention and resolution of conflicts. Recognizing the primary responsibility of the United Nations for the maintenance of international peace and security, the European Union will continue to cooperate, in a mutually reinforcing manner, with the United Nations, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), the Council of Europe and other international organizations in conflict prevention, crisis management and post-conflict resolution. In this context, the European Union has set itself the headline goal of being able by 2003 to deploy within 60 days, and sustain for at least one year, forces of up to 60,000 persons. The European Union also committed itself to providing by 2003, by way of voluntary cooperation, up to 5,000 police officers — 1,000 of them to be deployable within 30 days — for international missions across the full range of conflict-prevention and crisis-management operations.

At its meeting in Nice last month, the European Council confirmed its determination to continue strengthening the crisis management capabilities of the European Union in the military and civilian fields. The European Union intends to coordinate its activities closely with the United Nations principal organs, as well as with the OSCE and, in particular, the REACT special team and the Council of Europe. To this end, it was decided in Nice to identify possible areas and modalities of cooperation between the European Union and the United Nations in crisis management.

It is against this background that the European Union takes a keen interest in the cooperation between the Security Council and the troop-contributing countries. One of the priority issues for the European Union in the ongoing process to strengthen the United Nations activities for peace and security is the formulation of clear, credible and achievable mandates for peacekeeping operations. This objective implies, among other measures, a qualitative and quantitative improvement of consultations between the Security Council and troop-contributing countries, as well as greater transparency, a process which must be maintained throughout all phases of any peacekeeping operation, from the formulation of the mandate to its successful implementation. The European Union therefore welcomes the Security Council resolution 1327 (2000), which was adopted last November. It is a first and very important step in the right direction, consistent with the relevant provisions of the United Nations Charter.

The issue was also dealt with in the report of the recent extraordinary session of the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations, which the General Assembly considered last month. The report emphasized the necessity of significantly strengthening and formalizing the consultation process between the Security Council and troop-contributing countries in order to make it more meaningful. Such an evolution would also encourage more countries to contribute in proportion with their capacities and to increase the effectiveness of United Nations peacekeeping operations.

Similarly, the European Union believes that the planning process within the Secretariat can be made more effective, coherent and transparent. There is everything to be gained by involving troop-contributing countries in the early stages of planning new missions and throughout the lifetime of a mission,

particularly with regard to risk analysis and rules of engagement. In that context, the European Union would like to express its appreciation for the priority given to this issue by the Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations, Mr. Jean-Marie Guéhenno. The safety and security of peacekeeping personnel is a matter of utmost concern to all troop-contributing countries. Further measures in this regard should be developed as a priority.

Looking to the future, the European Union stands ready to consider positively other mechanisms that can strengthen the link between the Security Council and troop contributors. Among the ideas that could be considered is the proposal in the report of the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations, the so-called Brahimi report, that troop-contributing countries' advice to the Security Council might usefully be institutionalized via the establishment of ad hoc subsidiary organs of the Council, as provided for in Article 29 of the Charter.

The European Union would like to take this opportunity to reiterate its support for the Brahimi report. We welcome the work that has already been carried out in order to implement its recommendations, inter alia, the partial strengthening of the Secretariat that can be achieved since the Fifth Committee gave its approval last month.

While welcoming these developments, the European Union underlines the importance it attaches to an appropriate organizational structure and staffing of the Secretariat. More is needed in order to provide the Secretariat with sufficient resources to enable it to carry out its missions. The EU looks forward to the comprehensive review of the management, structure, recruitment processes and interrelationships of elements in the Secretariat that deal with peacekeeping, and to a resumption of the consideration of the Brahimi report in the General Assembly later this year.

The President: The next speaker is the representative of Canada. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Heinbecker (Canada) (*spoke in French*): I would like to thank you, Sir, for the generous words you addressed to Canada and the other countries that have just left the Council. I would also like to say how pleased I am to see former colleagues on the Council and to welcome the new members.

I would also like to thank you for having taken this important initiative to improve the consultative arrangements with troop-contributing countries. My Government would also like to say how satisfied it is that the Council has responded so quickly and thoroughly to the Brahimi report, by adopting resolution 1327 (2000), which clearly underscores many of the concerns of troop-contributing countries.

(spoke in English)

In addition, in the course of the past decade the Security Council also issued two presidential statements on how consultations with troop-contributing countries were to be conducted. Regrettably, the principles inherent in these statements have not been fully respected in the intervening years. But even if they had been respected, the communication of information to troop contributors would not have proved adequate in practice. The issue is not communications or consultations, although even here improvements are possible; the issue is cooperation and participation.

We collectively have not found a way for troop-contributing countries to be part of the Organization's peace operation decision-making process, from the start of a mission to its conclusion. It is time for us all to take stock of our collective experience. There is plenty of evidence to show that consultations by the Council with troop-contributing countries are necessary, but not sufficient. Troop contributors' views are not simple inputs to a decision of the Council; they are integral to effective decisions and must carry their full weight.

Any decision-making process that merely takes or leaves troop contributors' views risks alienating those Governments and exposing a mission to failure. In the course of last autumn, two major troop-contributing countries withdrew from the United Nations largest peace operation, at least in part, they have said, because they did not feel their views were heard and heeded.

The Security Council and the Secretariat must be able to win the confidence of troop-contributing Governments — Governments that put their soldier-citizens in harm's way — that the strategy and concept of operations for a new mission, and their implementation, are sound. Troop-contributing Governments must also be confident that they will be sending troops or police to serve within a competent

mission with effective leadership. That confidence comes from cooperation and participation, not notification and not even just consultations.

We need to think corporately about the relationship between the Council and troop contributors. We need to find a way to bring the latter into the decision-making processes of the former. We are all on the same side on this issue: the side of United Nations effectiveness.

Under Article 23 of the Charter, the Council bears the primary constitutional responsibility for maintaining international peace and security, and it has often been observed that it does not bear the exclusive responsibility. Strengthening peace operations is a challenge we all face. It should not be beyond the ingenuity of United Nations Members to find an effective way forward. If Council members are unwilling to share power, they then should take upon themselves the responsibility of providing the troops required. If, on the other hand, potential or actual troop-contributing countries are unable to rally to a consensus, then they should draw the appropriate conclusion.

During the fiftieth session of the General Assembly, Canada tabled a study that offered concrete recommendations on rapid reaction to crisis situations. The study recognized the need for a partnership between the Security Council and troop contributors and the Secretariat. Specifically, we suggested that the Security Council and troop contributors establish a joint committee for each peace operation. This idea, we believe, remains valid. I am mindful that in 1996 — for the abortive Zaire operation, which was led by Canada — we did collectively create such a committee. There was a nucleus established to manage and give direction to the mission, and it was, as long as the operation lasted, a successful initiative.

The Council and troop contributors, supported by the Secretariat, must work in partnership in a spirit of cooperation within an integrated management framework, rather than simply meet on occasion for what has largely become a pro forma bit of theatre.

We have heard many good ideas this morning, including those discussed in considerable detail by the Permanent Representative of India. In the next few days, we, Canada, will be circulating a paper that expands on some of our ideas about the next steps that the Council might consider taking in order to enhance cooperative arrangements. There is much that it is the same in the Indian and Canadian approaches.

We hope that the Council and troop contributors will find that these proposals are worth serious consideration. Six years after the adoption of the presidential statement I mentioned at the beginning, we endorse the Council's implicit conclusion today: that it is time to address today's needs. Failure to do so will only make it more difficult for the United Nations to respond in a timely and effective fashion when peace missions are needed. Success in doing so would help us all establish a decision-making process that integrates authority and risk. More fundamentally, doing so will help the United Nations meet the great expectations of so many people around the world who, now and in the future, depend on the United Nations — that is to say, depend on us.

The President: The next speaker is the representative of Egypt. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Bebars (Egypt) *(spoke in Arabic)*: I should like at the outset to congratulate you, Sir, on the assumption of your country, Singapore, to the presidency of the Security Council for the current month. I should like also to congratulate your country and the other new members of the Council and to wish them success in the discharge of their mandate over the next two years.

Let me also thank you, Mr. President, for convening this important meeting in order to address the urgent issue of enhancing the relationship and consultations between the troop-contributing countries and the Security Council, as this is a key element that must be addressed in the context of ongoing efforts in order to enhance the role and effectiveness of the United Nations in the area of peacekeeping.

This meeting, in our view, has a special significance, not only because it is the first of its kind, but also because it is being convened in the wake of the issuance of the Brahimi report and of the experience of many troop-contributing countries with the Council with respect to the United Nations Mission in Sierra Leone during the crisis that erupted in Sierra Leone last May.

The delegation of Egypt would like on this occasion to make the following remarks regarding the issue under discussion today, especially in view of

Egypt's longstanding and far-reaching experience in the area of contributing to United Nations peacekeeping operations, which it has been doing since 1960.

First, the goal of strengthening the relationship between the troop-contributing countries and the Security Council must be approached with a view to achieving optimum streamlining and harmonization in the work of the Organization with respect to the settlement of disputes. It is therefore necessary, as we have indicated in more than one forum, to institutionalize the consultation process between the troop-contributing countries and the Council at all stages of the evolution of an operation's mandate and in all steps taken by the Council to amend, review, extend or terminate such mandate and the functions that accompany it.

These consultations must apply to the potential troop-contributing countries at advanced stages, following the submission by the Secretary-General to the Council of his proposals on the establishment and deployment of a peacekeeping operation. This would be more likely to ensure a clear and implementable mandate.

Secondly, the ultimate goal, which we are all trying to attain, should go beyond merely listening to and exchanging views with the troop-contributing countries, even if that process takes place through the institutionalized modality that we are calling for.

The agreed measures to strengthen the relationship between the troop-contributing countries and the Security Council should lead to the participation by those countries in the Council's decision-making process at all stages of the establishment, deployment and withdrawal of a peacekeeping operation, especially when the use of force is involved, as provided for clearly in Article 44 of the Charter of the United Nations.

Regrettably, a wide gap remains between the demands of the troop-contributing countries, which insist on this position, and the stance taken by the Security Council, which remains convinced that the purpose of consolidating consultations is — and I quote here from resolution 1327 (2000) —

> "to foster a common understanding of the situation on the ground, of the mission's mandate and of its implementation" *(S/RES/1327, annex, part I, fifteenth paragraph)*.

Thirdly, when the Security Council understands that it cannot continue to refuse the legitimate requests of the troop-contributing countries to participate in the decision-making process within this forum, and when the Council recognizes that it can no longer disregard the views of countries that are willing to put the lives of their children in harm's way in order to implement a military mission which, as defined by the Council, involves a high level of risk and the use of force — only then can we establish the kind of relationship to which we all aspire between the Council and the troop-contributing countries. This would avert repetition the consequences that the absence of such a relationship has had in the past. Only then will we be able to overcome a most negative aspect that casts its shadow on the world Organization's discharge of its responsibilities in the area of peacekeeping.

Fourthly, despite the fact that the Council has recently developed the notion of holding "private" meetings with the troop-contributing countries as an innovative mechanism to listen to their views and observations, nonetheless we maintain that well-established modalities must be institutionalized to regulate these consultations. Such meetings should not be convened only when the Council decides to dispatch a mission composed of its members to a country that hosts a peacekeeping operation, or merely to brief the troop-contributing countries on the outcome of such a mission upon their return to Headquarters.

Furthermore, we demand that the Council respond to any request by a troop-contributing country to convene such a meeting, especially in cases where the Council is considering the amendment or review of a given peacekeeping mandate, or when there is a significant deterioration of security conditions in the region where the mission is operating that would jeopardize the safety and security of its personnel.

The delegation of Egypt believes that Security Council resolution 1327 (2000) represents a positive step forward in this context. It hopes that the Council will take the subsequent logical step of agreeing on well-defined modalities that govern the way these consultations are conducted as well as take into account the aforementioned points and put them into practice.

We commend you once again, Mr. President, for convening this meeting and for allowing the troop-contributing countries to make their observations before Council members speak. Allow me in closing to stress that strengthening the relationship between the troop-contributing countries and the Council is but one of the key elements that must be addressed in the framework of our collective efforts and shared responsibilities with a view to reforming peacekeeping operations.

Now that the General Assembly has adopted specific recommendations to reinforce the Department of Peacekeeping Operations and other divisions within the Secretariat that are concerned with the maintenance of international peace and security, two main issues remain that require adequate attention.

First, all States must pay their assessed dues and arrears to the United Nations budget, so that peacekeeping operations will stand on a solid financial basis that will ensure the provision of the necessary military and logistical requirements for troops participating in operations.

Secondly, the major Western Powers should reconsider their position of abstaining from participation in certain peacekeeping operations, especially in the African continent, under the pretext that such operations, from their perspective, involve an unacceptable level of risk.

The President: The next speaker inscribed on my list is the representative of Zambia. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Musambachime (Zambia): At the outset, my delegation would like to congratulate the new non-permanent members of the Security Council. We are confident that they will be able to make an important contribution to the work of the Council. My delegation wishes also to express its deep appreciation to the outgoing non-permanent members of the Council for the exemplary manner in which they discharged their responsibilities.

Allow me to congratulate you, Mr. President, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of January 2001, the start of the new millennium. I would also like to put on record my country's appreciation for the initiative to hold this meeting today. We could not agree more that this is an appropriate moment to review measures that could be taken to strengthen the effectiveness of United Nations peacekeeping operations. It is also a time to take advantage of the support and enthusiasm generated by the report of the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations.

In contributing to today's debate, I will confine my remarks to two points: first, the need for peacekeeping operations to have clear, credible and achievable mandates and adequate resources, and secondly, the need for greater cooperation and closer and meaningful consultations between the Security Council and the troop-contributing countries.

While encouraged with the Security Council's resolve to give peacekeeping operations clear, credible and achievable mandates, we have been disappointed to note that the question of adequate resources for these operations seems to have received very little attention. The non-availability of adequate resources has led to the failure of a number of peacekeeping operations in the developing world, especially in Africa. My delegation therefore strongly appeals to the Security Council to seriously address this question.

Let me commend the members of the Security Council for accepting the Brahimi Panel recommendations on consultations with troop-contributing countries. We are encouraged by the fact that they underlined the importance of an improved system of consultation among the troop-contributing countries, the Secretary-General and the Security Council.

Although we welcome the steps taken so far by the Security Council, we believe that they fall far short of what was envisaged in the Brahimi report or, indeed, what we, the troop-contributing countries, would like to see.

The Security Council should involve the troop-contributing countries in the consultation process in a manner that is institutional and meaningful. This process should start at the earliest stage of drawing up a peacekeeping operation and should continue until its completion.

Paragraph 61 of the Brahimi report states that member countries contributing formed military units to an operation should be invited to attend Secretariat briefings of the Security Council pertaining to crises that affect the safety and security of the mission's personnel or to a change or reinterpretation of a

mission's mandate with respect to the use of force. My delegation wishes to state that whenever the use of peacekeeping forces is contemplated, the Security Council should adhere to the provisions of Article 43 and Article 44 of the United Nations Charter.

We welcome the efforts being made by the Security Council on consultations. However, we feel that a lot more should be done to make them more meaningful. The involvement of troop-contributing countries in the planning and implementation stages could go a long way in improving the conduct of peacekeeping operations.

The consultations with Security Council members held before and after the missions to Sierra Leone and East Timor were very useful. Unfortunately, the same cannot be said of the traditional troop-contributors meetings held to discuss the Secretary-General's reports.

My delegation wishes to echo the sentiments expressed by other delegations that, regardless of the provisions of the Council's provisional rules of procedure, neither traditional troop-contributors meetings nor private formal meetings should be held in the Council Chamber. They should be in a format that allows a free exchange of views between the Council members and the troop-contributing countries, and they should include the necessary substantive briefings.

The President: The next speaker is the representative of New Zealand. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Mackay (New Zealand): It is a great pleasure to see you in the Chair, Mr. President. I want first to compliment you and the Singapore delegation for convening today's meeting on this important topic, as well as for your innovation in permitting non-members to speak first. Hopefully, this initiative will indeed promote greater interactivity.

Ambassador Mahbubani has asked us to keep our statements short and punchy, and I will try to oblige. I want to explain briefly why New Zealand takes a particular interest in this subject and what we would like to see by way of an outcome.

As Ambassador Listre of Argentina has mentioned before me, New Zealand and Argentina, while serving together on the Security Council in 1994, were perhaps pioneers in seeking the institutionalization of procedures to provide for appropriate consultation with Members outside the Council. Our joint letter to the President of the Council on 18 September 1994 (S/1994/1063) got the ball rolling and led to the institutionalization of the procedures set out in the presidential statement of 4 November 1994 (S/PRST/1994/62).

We sought these improvements because of our commitment to the key United Nations role in the maintenance of international peace and security and because of our concern to see the Organization do better in the face of some very great challenges at the time. That commitment has never diminished. New Zealand has been a willing contributor to United Nations operations for half a century. Our current level of contribution to United Nations peacekeeping is the highest ever. Over 30 per cent of the New Zealand army is at present involved in peacekeeping. We are represented in operations in Asia, Africa and Europe, with our biggest single contribution being a battalion group in East Timor.

We approach the question of strengthening cooperation with troop contributors, therefore, with strong credentials, we believe, and from the perspective that the Charter guarantees, under Article 44, those troop contributors who are not members of the Council the right to be heard by the Council, at the very least. As others have noted, the Charter speaks of troop contributors being invited to participate in the decisions of the Security Council concerning the employment of their contingents. This must be our starting point in considering the possible establishment of new mechanisms and the procedural issues that flow therefrom. We firmly believe that this Article must be given due weight in United Nations peacekeeping in the twenty-first century.

On paper, things have come a long way since 1994. Resolution 1327 (2000), adopted just two months ago by way of follow-up to the Brahimi Report, speaks of strengthening significantly the existing system of consultations through the holding of private meetings with troop-contributing countries. Even before that resolution was adopted, we were greatly encouraged by the private meeting between the Council and troop contributors to the United Nations Mission in Sierra Leone (UNAMSIL), which was held on 4 October last year. We very much hope that the format of this meeting might serve as a model for the implementation of private meetings in accordance with resolution 1327 (2000).

Among the key features of that 4 October meeting were the provision of an excellent briefing by Under-Secretary-General Guéhenno on the current political framework, a first-class military appreciation of the situation facing UNAMSIL, presented by Major-General Ford, and the readiness of the Council President at the time, Ambassador Andjaba of Namibia, to see a free and frank exchange of views among the participants. The content of troop-contributor meetings must be well prepared, as it was in this case. In particular, if the Council is to consider any proposals to alter significantly the mandate or the size of a force, we, for one, would expect a fuller military appreciation to be provided to Council members and to troop contributors in just such a meeting, and we have heard here today from a number of other troop contributors who very clearly share this view.

Timeliness is also an essential requirement if meetings between the Council and troop contributors are to have value. May we applaud your efforts, Mr. President, for the way in which you have scheduled troop-contributor meetings for the four operations whose mandates expire this month — the United Nations Mission of Observers in Prevlaka, the United Nations Transitional Administration in East Timor, the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon and the United Nations Observer Mission in Georgia — well in advance of Council consideration.

The strengthening of cooperation with troop contributors is of very great importance to our capitals, especially as United Nations operations grow more complex and more hazardous. We must be able to demonstrate to our parliaments and to our publics that we have an avenue to contribute to decisions that affect our servicemen and women. Equally, in these days when only a few Council members can be counted among the major troop-contributing countries to United Nations operations, there would seem to be an imperative for Council members to seek the views of troop contributors, especially on issues concerning the safety and security of United Nations peacekeepers. As my delegation argued in the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations as far back as April 1994, there is a direct correlation between the willingness of Member States to commit personnel to United Nations operations and the level of comfort with mechanisms in place for consultation.

Finally, comment has been sought on the idea of establishing a special subcommittee of the Council on peacekeeping operations. We recall that the Brahimi report indeed suggested, in paragraph 61, that troop-contributor advice to the Security Council might usefully be institutionalized through the establishment of ad hoc subsidiary organs of the Council. We believe that a formal committee should in fact be established. The committee, chaired by the President, should comprise all the members of the Council and every Member State which is contributing formed units to the peacekeeping operation on the committee's agenda. The committee would have a regular cycle of meetings, as well as being convened to discuss new deployments, new mandates and other significant changes to an operation, including troop reductions. There might well be scope for an informal subcommittee, perhaps meeting at the expert level with officials of the Department of Peacekeeping Operations, to assist the committee. We hope these ideas can be taken further.

In sum, we congratulate you, Mr. President, on using your office this month to focus on an issue of very great interest to the wider membership. You have shown by example how the Council's business can be managed in a way which provides for the interests of troop contributors to be properly taken into account. We look forward to contributing further where we can to concrete recommendations which will lead to a better relationship between the body charged with maintaining international peace and security on our behalf and those countries that predominantly provide the means to carry out its decisions.

The President: The next speaker inscribed on my list is the representative of Malaysia. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Hasmy (Malaysia): Mr. President, I should like at the outset to extend my delegation's heartiest congratulations to you on Singapore's assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of January and to express my pleasure at seeing you preside over the meeting of the Council today. We commend you and your delegation for organizing this timely debate as a useful follow-up to previous deliberations in the Council on this subject. I should also like to pay tribute to Ambassador Lavrov of the Russian Federation for his effective leadership of the Council last month. I am equally pleased to greet the new members of the Council, as well as, of course, my

former colleagues on the Council, and to wish them every success.

I should like to thank Ambassador Kishore Mahbubani for providing the extremely useful background paper to assist us in preparing our participation in the debate. I also appreciate the fact that we, the non-members of the Council, are being heard before the members of the Council. We commend the Singapore presidency for pushing through this welcome, innovative approach. As Ambassador Mahbubani pointed out in his letter to the Secretary-General of 8 January 2001, the need was clearly felt for greater consultation between troop-contributing countries (TCCs), the Security Council and the Secretariat and that more could be done in this area. Indeed, this issue had been addressed on a number of occasions, both in the Council and the General Assembly. The Brahimi Panel on United Nations Peace Operations underscored this need for enhanced consultations and made a number of recommendations which had subsequently been endorsed by the Security Council and the General Assembly through Council resolution 1327 (2000) of 13 November 2000 and General Assembly resolution 55/135 of 8 December 2000.

Among these recommendations is that regarding the importance of continuous, focused and in-depth consultations between the Council and the TCCs that go beyond the regular TCC meetings presided over by the President of the Council. Like other countries that have participated in peacekeeping operations, Malaysia has always believed in the need for a formalized mechanism of consultations between the Council and TCCs to give effect to Article 44 of the Charter, which provides for the participation of TCCs in the decisions of the Council pertaining to peacekeeping operations in which their armed forces are involved. We have in the past referred to specific areas for further consultations, including, first, when the mandate of a new peacekeeping operation is being formulated; secondly, when the concept and/or plan of operation of a peacekeeping operation is being considered; thirdly, when the extension of the mandate of a peacekeeping operation is being considered; fourthly, when a substantive modification of the mandate of an existing peacekeeping operation — including the broadening or narrowing of its scope, changes in the rules of engagement and the introduction of new functions or components — is being considered; fifthly, when significant developments occur which, in the opinion of the Secretary-General, members of the Security Council or troop contributors, are likely to affect materially the functioning of the operation and/or its ability to fulfil its mandate; and, finally, when the withdrawal, in whole or in part, of an operation is being considered.

While we continue to believe in the need for a subsidiary organ of the Council to coordinate consultations with the TCCs, we welcome the recently established mechanism of the so-called "private meetings" between the Council, the Secretariat and the TCCS as a step in the right direction. It is to be hoped that these meetings will be not merely briefing sessions, but serious discussions between Council members, TCCs and the Secretariat on the whole gamut of issues pertaining to specific peacekeeping operations. They should be held as often as necessary, but especially on those occasions which I enumerated earlier. We hope that this new mechanism will not be just an ad hoc arrangement, but will be formalized to give substance to the spirit of Article 44 of the Charter.

Notwithstanding the mechanism of the private meetings, there may be a need to maintain the mechanism of the regular TCC meetings to supplement the private meetings. However, the TCC meetings could be made more interactive and useful and less ritualistic if they were convened well ahead of the renewal of a peacekeeping operation, not just before, as is often the case. There should be, for the sake of greater transparency, an increased willingness to share information with troop-contributing countries about the situation on the ground. While the need for confidentiality is well appreciated, a lack of information very often leads to misinterpretation and even a distortion of events, with often negative reactions in the capitals of troop-contributing countries, especially in tense situations, as was the case in Sierra Leone. The situation is made worse when unconfirmed reports come directly from the ground from non-United Nations Secretariat sources. As in the case of the private meetings between the Council and troop-contributing countries, the challenge to make the TCC meetings more meaningful lies not only with the Council and the Secretariat, but also with the troop-contributing countries themselves.

On the issue of the commitment gaps in the contribution of troops to United Nations peacekeeping operations, there are several reasons for these, not the

least of which is the tardiness in reimbursing the costs of peacekeeping operations to developing countries, which creates difficulties, both economic and political, for the TCCs from the developing world. There is also the issue of the safety and security of troops in the peacekeeping areas of operation and the politically sensitive issue of acceptable risks, which potential troop-contributing countries have to grapple with before making a decision to commit troops. The problem is sometimes compounded by the very fluid situation on the ground. There is also the issue of the lack of adequate equipment and, sometimes, of training, which stands in the way of a quick and positive response to requests by the United Nations for troop contributions, particularly on the part of the developing countries.

More thought should be given to overcoming this problem of commitment gaps. Clearly, reimbursements should be made early and on time so as to generate the necessary political support in the potential troop-contributing countries concerned. Perhaps, with the resolution of the issue of the new scales of assessment, the problem will soon be resolved. As regards security, clearly, no Government would want to send its troops into harm's way and any Government would want assurances of an acceptable level of security before troops are committed. We trust that, under this new format of enhanced consultations, there will be a greater appreciation by the potential troop-contributing countries of the mandate for the peacekeeping operation in question, which can be facilitated by their more intimate involvement in the planning of that mandate.

On the issue of training and equipment, we feel that more could be done by the developed countries, in partnership with their counterparts in the developing world, which may have resources in terms of manpower but lack the wherewithal. Such logistical and training support from the developed countries could well enable developing countries to make their contribution to peacekeeping operations. However, this does not argue for a strict division of labour between the developed and developing countries, whereby the former provide the economic means for peacekeeping operations while the latter provide the manpower. United Nations peacekeeping is an international responsibility to be shared by all States Members of the Organization in all its aspects, but a case can, and has in fact been made, for logistical, training and other technical support from the developed countries for potential troop contributors from the developing countries, even as the former participate actively themselves in peacekeeping operations.

There should be greater utilization of the stand-by arrangement between the United Nations Secretariat and potential troop-contributing countries. This arrangement should be strengthened, not only by involving more countries, but, more importantly, by tapping the resources available in those countries for current and future peacekeeping operations. The exercise undertaken by the Secretariat to audit and evaluate these assets is a welcome move in the right direction.

To fully utilize this standby arrangement, countries that have entered into such an arrangement should be given priority to participate in peacekeeping operations and their offers considered first before being turned down for specific reasons, which should be explained to the potential contributing countries. This would further bolster, rather than dampen, commitment to the stand-by arrangement. We would suggest that, following the ongoing auditing and evaluation exercise of these assets, serious efforts be made to evaluate and, where necessary, upgrade them to minimum United Nations standards through training and technical support from both the Secretariat and/or developed country partners so as to ensure their readiness for deployment for peacekeeping operations at the appropriate time. Perhaps, in this regard, serious consideration should be given not only to upgrading the United Nations Staff College in Turin, but also to establishing regional United Nations staff colleges to provide the necessary training to military officers of the TCCs, in addition to the ongoing support given to national peacekeeping centres. There are creative ways of establishing these staff colleges, in collaboration with Member States, without necessarily having to start from scratch. If appropriately provided with trained staff and utilized, these stand-by arrangements would be a good and relatively inexpensive substitute for that much-desired, but still elusive United Nations standing army that Brian Urquhart and others dreamed about.

My delegation would like to stress the importance of ensuring proper command and control as indispensable ingredients of the success of a peacekeeping operation. For this purpose, it is essential for troop-contributing countries, without exception, to accept the doctrine of unified United Nations command

in peacekeeping missions authorized by the Security Council. Malaysia's experience in various peacekeeping operations, especially in the United Nations Operation in Somalia II, which it had the honour to command, tells us that only effective command and control, backed by trained and professional staff, can guarantee the success of a peacekeeping operation. Any compromise on this all-important principle would be a recipe for disaster. In this regard, the selection of a highly qualified force commander with the right attributes is as important as the selection of a competent civilian head of a United Nations mission. To enable the force commander to fully appreciate the complexity of commanding United Nations troops on the ground, it is important that he, like his civilian head of mission, be given the opportunity to interact with Council members and the representatives of the troop-contributing countries through briefing sessions in New York.

Finally, my delegation wishes to underscore the need for objective and impartial assessments of situations on the ground and hence the importance of allowing the Secretariat to provide unvarnished and professional reports to Council members as well as to the TCCs. The TCCs, which provide the peacekeepers, have as much right as Council members to be adequately informed of developments that affect their personnel. It is important for the Council to send a message to the TCCs that their views are important in all matters pertaining to peacekeeping and that they are not taken for granted by the Council.

The President: The last speaker for this part of the meeting is the representative of Nigeria. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Mbanefo (Nigeria): Permit me to congratulate you, Mr. President, on your recent election to the Security Council and on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for this month. My delegation has great confidence in your ability to effectively guide the Council during your presidency, and we want to assure you of our unwavering support.

The debate on strengthening cooperation with troop-contributing countries is as timely as it is appropriate. This is because during the Millennium Summit and the Millennium Assembly a lot of energy was devoted to the issue of peacekeeping operations and how to make them more effective. The Brahimi Panel's report on peacekeeping operations generated significant interest among Member States and thereby renewed the momentum to push for strengthening the capacity of the United Nations peacekeeping operations. Both the Security Council and the General Assembly endorsed various recommendations of the Security Council working group and of the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations on the Panel's report. It is therefore commendable that the Council decided to debate under your presidency, Sir, the issues raised.

As a major troop contributor to United Nations peacekeeping operations, Nigeria has always felt the need for better coordination and consultation between troop- contributing countries, the Security Council and the Secretariat. This, in our view, is the best way to forge trust and understanding among the various stakeholders and to ensure the success of the various United Nations peacekeeping operations. While the Security Council may be responsible for issuing mandates, and the Secretariat may be responsible for logistics and administration through the Department of Peacekeeping Operations, it is troop-contributing countries that actually translate Security Council mandates into action. It is their soldiers that are deployed in the field to face the dangers of war and, sometimes, to make the ultimate sacrifice in the process. It is therefore important that these three bodies continue to consult among themselves for the eventual success of any operation at hand.

War and conflict constitute a phenomenon that has been associated with the existence of homo sapiens. While time has changed the means and tools of war, the basic instinct of man's desire to overpower the other has remained unchanged. The creation of our Organization, the United Nations, was itself a reaction intended to curb man's desire for war and to save the human race from self-destruction. Since the creation of the United Nations, in 1945, and despite its best efforts in this direction, wars and conflicts have remained a constant factor in man's geopolitical and geo-strategic thinking. This led to the cold war, the consequent arms race and nuclear proliferation.

Recently, new forms of conflict have emerged that are mainly intra-State in nature. Some of these conflicts arose as a result of deliberate post-colonial policy to bring together, sometimes by force, ethnic groups that had lived independently and, often, in an adversarial relationship with one another. Others arose

because of contests over the control of national resources and/or the machinery of government. The situation is further compounded by dwindling economic development and an increase in the level of poverty in most developing countries. Consequently, most of the conflicts to emerge have been in developing countries. Today, post-independence African countries are faced with the challenges of peace, security and stability. The intensification of these conflicts in the post-cold-war period has led to the phenomenon of failed States in such places as Liberia and Somalia, where all institutions of government have disintegrated.

As a result of these conflicts there has been an uncontrollable increase in United Nations peacekeeping activities in recent years. The number of troops, military observers and civilian police personnel involved has now risen to about 40,000, from approximately 15,000 barely a year ago. Current United Nations missions include the United Nations Mission in Sierra Leone (UNAMSIL), the United Nations Mission in Ethiopia and Eritrea, the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the United Nations Mission in Kosovo and the United Nations Transitional Administration in East Timor, just to mention a few. These United Nations missions have met with varying degrees of success, and in some cases they have met with total disaster or setback, such as in Somalia and in the recent abduction of several UNAMSIL troops in Sierra Leone.

If we are to stem the rising tide of conflicts in the world and to ensure the success of United Nations peacekeeping operations, the United Nations must redefine its strategies and embrace closer consultation and cooperation among stakeholders. This is why my delegation embraces the recommendation contained in the Brahimi Panel's report, which has also been endorsed by the Security Council and the General Assembly. If they are to be achieved, mandates must not only be clear and credible, there must also be adequate coordination and consultation between potential troop-contributing countries and the members of the Security Council during the mandate-formulation process. The report also recommended the establishment of an ad hoc subsidiary organ of the Council, as provided for under Article 29 of the Charter, so as to institutionalize the advice of troop-contributing countries to the Security Council.

My delegation welcomes these and all other recommendations requiring that troop-contributing countries be consulted when the concept and/or plan of operation of a peacekeeping operation is being considered; when the extension of the mandate of a peacekeeping operation is being considered; when a substantive modification of the mandate of an existing peacekeeping operation, including the broadening or narrowing of the geographical scope, changes in rules of engagement and the introduction of new functions of its components are being considered; and, finally, during cost consideration for the selection of field commanders.

It is heart-warming to observe that after the Brahimi Panel's report the Secretary-General has come out in support of the need for

> "countries that have committed military units to an operation [to] have access to Secretariat briefings to the Council on matters affecting the safety and security of their personnel, especially those meetings with implications for a mission's use of force." *(S/2000/809, para. 64 (d))*

It is our belief that a clear exchange of facts and an assessment of the risks involved in an operation will better prepare the minds of troop-contributing countries for possible political backlash at home resulting from their involvement in United Nations peacekeeping operations. This sense of mutual trust, if created through open and frank consultations, will make potential troop contributors more forthcoming and accept joint responsibilities for decisions taken.

Consultation by itself is not enough when the advice of those who have relevant experience, whether solicited or not, is not taken into consideration. We believe that the views of troop-contributing countries and of other regional actors should be taken into consideration at all stages of decision-making on peacekeeping operations, as has been recommended. While we are not saying that the present system is adequate, we nevertheless wish to commend the Security Council's initiative of holding consultation with the Economic Community of West African States ministerial Mediation and Security Committee on Sierra Leone, led by the Malian Foreign Minister, Modibo Sidibé, which held extensive consultations last year with members of the Council on the situation in Sierra Leone.

The outcome of that consultation and the subsequent visits of the Security Council members to various conflict areas in Africa definitely were useful, as they led to better appreciation of the issues involved. In addition, they played significant roles in renewing the confidence of our subregion, and indeed the continent, in the capability and sincerity of the Security Council in maintaining international peace and security. This approach of holding consultations with regional leaders and troop-contributing countries should, therefore, be sustained and institutionalized.

It is our sincere hope that at the end of this debate, a common ground on the method of consultation among the Security Council, the Secretariat and the troop-contributing countries will be found. My delegation would like to suggest that the Secretariat should, in addition to the other points mentioned earlier, consult troop-contributing countries during the review of document guidelines manuals. In addition, it would be appreciated if the briefing notices and working papers could be gazetted and circulated well in advance to the troop-contributing countries. The operational briefings by the Department of Peacekeeping Operations to troop-contributing countries should also be in written form.

My delegation will appreciate it if the Secretariat will assume responsibility for the transportation and accommodation costs of those delegates who may be invited from capitals to brief or consult with the Security Council or the Secretariat on issues relating to ongoing peacekeeping operations.

Finally, Mr. President, I would like to conclude by extending the warm congratulations of the Nigerian delegation to the newly elected non-permanent members of the Security Council: namely, Mauritius, Singapore, of course, Colombia, Ireland and Norway. My delegation wishes to reassure you of its commitment to the Charter of our Organization, particularly its provisions regarding the maintenance of international peace and security.

The President: I will now suspend the meeting. In accordance with the understanding reached among members of the Council, when we resume this afternoon, I will first give the floor to Council members.

The meeting was suspended at 1.25 p.m.

United Nations S/PV.4257 (Resumption 1)

Security Council

Fifty-sixth year

Provisional

4257th meeting

Tuesday, 16 January 2001, 3 p.m.
New York

President:	Mr. Jayakumar	(Singapore)
Members:	Bangladesh	Mr. Chowdhury
	China	Mr. Shen Guofang
	Colombia	Mr. Valdivieso
	France	Mr. Levitte
	Ireland	Mr. Ryan
	Jamaica	Miss Durrant
	Mali	Mr. Ouane
	Mauritius	Mr. Neewoor
	Norway	Mr. Kolby
	Russian Federation	Mr. Gatilov
	Tunisia	Mr. Ben Mustapha
	Ukraine	Mr. Kuchynski
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Sir Jeremy Greenstock
	United States of America	Mr. Cunningham

Agenda

Strengthening cooperation with troop-contributing countries

Letter dated 8 January 2001 from the Permanent Representative of Singapore to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General (S/2001/21)

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-178.

01-21482 (E)

The meeting was resumed at 3.15 p.m.

Mr. Cunningham (United States of America): Mr. President, we want to welcome you to the Council and to give Singapore its due for having taken the initiative to organize and convene this discussion, which I found very interesting this morning, as, I am sure, did my colleagues.

I have taken heed of the suggestion that we take advantage of the lunch period to think about some of the items that were broached this morning by the troop contributors who spoke. There were a lot of recommendations and a lot of thoughts advanced. As the paper the presidency produced points out, there is already a long history of decisions in regard to the question of how consultations between the Security Council and the troop contributors should be organized. It is obvious — and I do not think this is a question of ill will on anybody's part; in fact, I am quite sure it is not — that the situation is still not satisfactory, as has been made clear repeatedly over the years and was made perfectly clear this morning.

Let me add that the situation is not satisfactory from our point of view, either. We have given lots of thought to the need to improve the exchange of information. The members of the Security Council need, and the United Nations as a whole needs, stronger cooperation between the troop-contributing countries and the Security Council and, I would add, between the Secretary-General and the Secretariat. We have at least three major actors here, not just two.

I think our shared goal, as it came out this morning as well, is that we want to make the operations of peacekeeping more effective and more efficient. To do that, we need a real partnership, and that requires somewhat of a change in mentality, I think, as some of the speakers noted this morning. We need the troop contributors, the Security Council and the Secretary-General to look at each other as partners in a common endeavour with a common purpose.

I want to recall Ambassador Heinbecker's exhortation this morning about integrating authority with risk. I think that is a very good way to look at the issue. This requires input, will and commitment from each participant in this partnership to make it work better. That means meaningful and active participation, thought and some consideration for the other partners. It does not necessarily mean new mechanisms as such. We have lots of mechanisms and there are lots of ideas that have been floated and tried in the past. We can have regular meeting upon meeting upon meeting in various orders and sequences, but they risk becoming, as at least one speaker said this morning, ritualistic if we do not put the proper content and spirit into them.

I also want to note — in connection with those who spoke about the effectiveness of United Nations operations and the need to ensure the security of peacekeeping operations — that the United States remains the largest contributor of United Nations civilian police, with well over 800 personnel deployed to United Nations peacekeeping operations. Therefore we are more than sympathetic with the concerns of troop contributors for the safety of their personnel.

The bottom line here is that we should all want the means of exchange that works, that informs the troop contributors adequately and on a timely basis, that really provides input to Security Council decision-making, that improves implementation and improves the clarity of mandates and, at the end of the day, that produces clearer goals and better performance. This will require meaningful, interactive exchanges among the troop contributors, the Secretariat and the Security Council. A good example — the best one that I have seen so far and one that others have also cited this morning — was the series of meetings that we had in connection with the United Nations Mission in Sierra Leone (UNAMSIL) this fall and the Security Council mission that visited UNAMSIL, where we had good informal and informed exchanges that really did fit the parameters that I have just been discussing.

My delegation is open to new ideas to build a better process and to overcome inertia. Our other overriding concern has to be that Security Council efficiency and fulfilment of responsibilities is maintained, as is set out under the Charter. Several people spoke about that also this morning. We would not think it wise to blur the responsibilities of the participants in this partnership or to hinder Council decision-making. We are confident that we can improve on this partnership without doing so.

We can use existing mechanisms. We can find ways to have more interactive exchanges between the troop contributors, the Secretariat and the Security Council. The troop contributors should take the initiative when they feel it appropriate, or when an individual troop contributor, for that matter, feels the

need to so do. In that regard, I applaud the Deputy Secretary-General's comments this morning about her openness, and that of the Department of Peacekeeping Operations, in that regard. That is the right attitude, and it should be taken advantage of.

We have accomplished a great deal in the past six months with the Brahimi report and follow-up to strengthen the Department of Peacekeeping Operations as well as United Nations peacekeeping operations. We need to continue that effort, since this work is at the heart of providing real capabilities to the problems we have been discussing. We should work to make Security Council resolution 1327 (2000) a reality. It contains good ideas and good intentions, and we need to work to bring them into being. I want also to echo the suggestion of the representative of Pakistan and others that, as we are going through this effort, we take a look at the resources of the Department of Peacekeeping Operations, not only to make sure that it has the resources it needs for mounting an operation but also the resources required to conduct effective liaison with the Security Council and the troop contributors.

My delegation is willing to look at new ideas to bolster this process, but as I have stated, we do not confuse mechanisms and more meetings with substance, cooperation and partnership. We all know the problem; it has been around for a while. We are willing to work very hard to address it, and we suggest that we proceed to do so without further delay.

Sir Jeremy Greenstock (United Kingdom): Mr. President, it is very good to see you in the chair today. Thank you, Mr. Minister, for your delegation's very imaginative approach to this debate. I also would like to thank the Deputy Secretary-General for her statement, which set us off to a good start.

The Permanent Representative of Sweden spoke this morning on behalf of the European Union, and what he said reflected the United Kingdom's views on the fundamental points of this issue. But I would like to say a few words from our own perspective as a Council member and as a regular and major contributor to peacekeeping in one form or another. I would also like to react to some of the interesting and substantive interventions of troop contributors this morning, which set out a number of points that we will have to take into account.

It was a good idea to have this debate in this format. As we in the Security Council, and others in the wider United Nations system, grapple with making peacekeeping operations work better, one thing has become clear. We — that is, the Council and the Secretariat — need a comprehensive approach to peacekeeping that looks at reform in a cohesive way and raises the professional capability of the United Nations effort across the board. Our key partners in that must be the troop contributors. I very much agree with Ambassador Cunningham's accent on partnership.

The non-paper that your delegation, Mr President, circulated before this debate acknowledged that this is not a new subject. But it has resurfaced with force in recent months. Some of the contributors to the United Nations Mission in Sierra Leone (UNAMSIL) spoke this morning about their particular experiences of that operation. The points of criticism are perhaps not quite so clear cut as has sometimes been suggested, but we must take careful note of what they have said. The Brahimi report also pointed out the need to involve troop contributors in our work in a much more systematic way.

The truth is that peacekeeping operations in 2001 face much more complex challenges than the mechanisms we have so far put in place can meet. The nature of conflict has changed. National contingents have harder work to do in securing peace in situations where the parties to a conflict can be difficult to identify and where their commitment to peace is all too often ambivalent, or worse. Contingents have been given new and tougher tasks in ever more complicated situations, where the political problems are not necessarily solved by a force deployment or a peace agreement.

We should be clear that the benefits of a more proactive approach to cooperation are not merely to be found in building a better relationship with contributors, important though that may be. Driving for more effective peacekeeping operations means ensuring that contributors know what to expect in both general and specific terms. Better and more regular consultations will ensure that national contingents do not arrive in theatre unprepared or unequipped for the mission that the Council expects them to fulfil. They should mean a more cohesive operation, with all contributors clear about the goals that the Security Council has set. And they will help to ensure that the resolutions we adopt will not be paper tigers, fruitless

in practice because the necessary contributions cannot be found for a mandate that is over-ambitious.

Everybody recognizes that the arrangements we have had for cooperation with troop contributors in the past have not worked properly. The standard meetings have too frequently been desultory affairs, with little or no exchange of views, though the fault for that is not necessarily only on one side. We need to know how current or potential contributors feel about the decisions we are planning to take. They need to be able to comment on the Secretariat's and the Council's analysis of the situation. For instance, what information might they have from their contingents on the ground that would impact on our considerations? We need to explain better to them the specific concerns that are driving our work. The aim is, as the European Union statement says, greater transparency throughout all the phases of a peacekeeping operation.

That is not to say that the Security Council should devolve its Charter duties. The troop contributors are not contesting, I think, that the Council makes its own decisions, in line with its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. But we must do so on the basis of the widest possible consultation. Our decisions have to be right, and the implementation of them has to be quick and effective. No national defence system, and no large corporation, would separate out its decision-making and its operational processes to the extent that the United Nations has done up to now.

We also need to bear in mind that Security Council consultations with troop contributors cannot cover all of the ground. Informal consultation between troop-contributing countries (TCCs) and the Department of Peacekeeping Operations will remain critical to the task of preparing and sustaining effective peacekeeping operations. As the European Union statement made clear, this will require decisive action to give the Secretariat the capacity it needs to do the job. While the new posts endorsed by the Fifth Committee before Christmas are a good start, we need to take further steps to improve the planning capacity of the Organization, the military and the civilian police. A proper flow of information to the troop contributors means ensuring that the Secretariat has a proper analytical capacity. We need to revisit the concept of an Information and Strategic Analysis Secretariat, or EISAS, which was contained in the Brahimi report.

Resolution 1327 (2000) gave us a good framework for all this work. Holding a private meeting at key stages of the consideration of new or evolving mandates will help. But new procedures are only half the story. We also need a step change in our attitudes. We in the Council, the Secretariat and the troop contributors have a shared responsibility to make those consultations productive: to exchange views in a frank and forthright manner and to listen to what others have to say.

When I spoke at the Council debate on "No exit without strategy" on 15 November, I suggested forming a working group of the Council to look at generic peacekeeping issues. I think it is now time to move to a decision on this idea, which will provide the Council with a new instrument to increase the effectiveness of its work in this area, while respecting the prerogatives of the General Assembly.

A working group would bring cohesion to the way the Council handles peacekeeping, currently all too often dealt in an ad hoc way in piecemeal discussion or through thematic debates. It would allow us to take a step back from time to time and examine the overall trends in our work on peacekeeping, learning lessons where we can. It could examine in depth particular issues causing problems. It would also help us to look carefully at our working methods. We need to be sure that we are getting the best military advice and that our own decisions are militarily sound. A working group would give us the machinery to address that issue. It might also play a role in establishing a more direct and proactive relationship with the troop contributors, who could perhaps think of forming a corresponding grouping for each main operation.

Neither should such a working group shy away from the difficult questions that United Nations peacekeeping must face if it is to become a truly professional force for international peace and security. These could include questions such as the increasingly robust nature of modern peacekeeping and — another issue I raised in the November open debate — the reasons why modern hi-tech armies may be unwilling to put themselves under United Nations command and control. These are not easy questions to address and we will not always agree, but a frank and open discussion would help. Above all, it would help us to see beyond the frequent assumption that political attitudes are

always the problem, when there are often concrete and resolvable difficulties that should be addressed.

I look forward to your summing up of this debate, Mr. President. It is clear from what we heard from the troop contributors this morning that we have food for thought and a need for pragmatic change. Where there are substantive ideas for progress that can find consensus, we should move to decisions quickly, but we should be clear that what is required is as much a change of approach as a change in procedure. My delegation is beginning to make that shift and we look forward to working through the various problems that we will face in the future with our partners both in the Security Council and in the wider United Nations system.

Mr. Ben Mustapha (Tunisia) (*spoke in French*): At the outset, I wish to welcome you warmly, Sir, and to express our pleasure at seeing you personally preside over this important meeting of the Security Council, which your country recently joined. I wish to commend Ambassador Mahbubani and his team, who have skilfully and competently guided the work of the Council since the beginning of this month.

I also wish to congratulate your country for choosing the issue of strengthening cooperation with troop-contributing countries for our debate today. This is an issue which has assumed increasing importance recently in the light of the various reports on peacekeeping operations that were issued last year and that have elicited great interest within the United Nations, the most recent of which was the Brahimi report. These reports unleashed a certain momentum to improve United Nations peacekeeping operations. Strengthening consultations and cooperation with troop-contributing countries is among the required tools for attaining that objective.

The document you have offered us in connection with this debate, for which we thank you, places the issue of strengthening cooperation with troop-contributing countries in its historical context, identifies areas for such cooperation and suggests specific points on which our debate might focus today. Participation in this debate by States that are not Security Council members and that contribute troops is significant.

Tunisia is a troop-contributing country and, since the 1960s, has participated in several United Nations peacekeeping operations in various regions of the world. We share many of the views and ideas expressed this morning by troop-contributing countries.

Troop-contributing countries play an essential role in the implementation on the ground of the mandates of peacekeeping operations created by the Security Council. Their soldiers have been increasingly called upon to fulfil complex and dangerous mandates. Thus, the Security Council's decisions in this area have consequences for those countries, most of which are not members of the Council and hence not involved in drafting the mandates assigned to their contingents.

Experience has shown that the absence of consultations and cooperation with troop-contributing countries can create serious difficulties, and even embarrassing situations, in the implementation of mandates, as was clearly described this morning by the representatives of troop-contributing countries. Those countries have continuously called for significant improvements in the consultation process. The recent tribulations of the United Nations Mission in Sierra Leone have been frequently cited as an example of situations that may arise from the absence of cooperation and consultation with troop-contributing countries.

The debate of recent months within the United Nations on peacekeeping operations has made us even more aware of the urgent need significantly to strengthen consultation and cooperation between troop-contributing countries, the Security Council and the Secretariat. The Brahimi report stressed the value of institutionalizing such consultations. In his report on implementing the Brahimi report, the Secretary-General fully agreed with the view of the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations on the need to strengthen consultations between troop-contributing countries and the Security Council, inter alia, through new procedures and mechanisms. Tunisia fully supports that recommendation and, during negotiations in the Council on resolution 1327 (2000) on the recommendations of the Brahimi report, advocated the Council's endorsement of the institutionalization of consultations with troop-contributing countries and the convening of meetings with them at their request. In its decision, however, the Council did not go so far as to institutionalize consultations.

Nevertheless, we welcome the compromise arrived at by the members of the Council, which we consider to be a first step in the right direction. The

General Assembly, for its part, supported strengthening consultations and we feel that the time has now come to implement these decisions.

In accordance with resolution 1327 (2000), the Security Council must hold private meetings with troop-contributing countries, including at their request, before drafting a mission mandate and throughout its implementation. We see such meetings as ad hoc meetings in which there is genuine dialogue among Council members, troop-contributing countries and the Secretariat on a given peacekeeping operation so that information and views can be exchanged before the Council takes any decision on the operation and its mandate. At these meetings, the Secretariat would inform the Security Council and the troop-contributing countries of the mission's scope and any potential risks. Such meetings could address the question of the security and safety of personnel, an issue that was stressed by several speakers this morning. In this way, troop-contributing countries will be able to assess the situation and their views will be taken into account.

We see this format as a first step that could be followed by other, larger steps. The Permanent Representative of Jordan suggested this morning that, a year from now, the Security Council hold another debate on strengthening consultations with troop-contributing countries and we support that suggestion. A second debate could provide us with an opportunity to assess the implementation and value of the format agreed on by the Council.

Moreover, the holding by the Secretariat of regular informational meetings for troop-contributing countries and the conveying of timely, relevant and comprehensive information regarding personnel on the ground will make it possible for those countries to follow the development of a peacekeeping operation at every stage.

The Security Council should continue to hold meetings with troop-contributing countries before the departure of a Council mission so as to consult with them about the objective of the mission. A second meeting should be devoted to dealing with the results of the mission. Last year, the Council held public meetings to discuss the results of some of its missions. The participation of troop-contributing countries and other Member States of the Organization at such meetings provides for greater transparency in the Council's work and also serves to broaden and take into account the views of other States Members of the United Nations.

It would be useful for the Security Council, troop-contributing countries and the Secretariat to hold an assessment meeting at the conclusion of a peacekeeping operation to draw lessons from the operation and to identify the strong points and the lacunae in its management, which will help to better prepare future operations.

I would also like to stress the importance of consultations between the Secretariat and troop-contributing countries in the preparation of guidelines for peacekeeping personnel. Such consultations can help ensure the effective implementation of approved guidelines.

Meaningful dialogue and cooperation at all stages of a mission will make it possible for all parties concerned to take their decisions with full knowledge of a given situation, strengthen mutual trust and encourage Member States to contribute more to peacekeeping operations. This is a matter of developing a true partnership that can ensure the success of peacekeeping operations.

These are some of the issues that could be dealt with in consultations with troop-contributing countries. But there may also be other consultations held in different formats according to how things develop in the future.

In addition to the principles that have always guided them, to succeed, peacekeeping operations must count on several elements. Those include clear mandates, adequate resources, consultation, and cooperation and coordination at all levels. Today's debate will certainly contribute to finding ways to give new impetus to cooperation among troop-contributing countries, the Security Council and the Secretariat.

Miss Durrant (Jamaica): Allow me to welcome you most warmly, Mr. Minister, on behalf of the Government and people of Jamaica. My delegation is confident that under your guidance this debate will prove extremely useful in helping the United Nations and its Member States to address the increasing complexities of peacekeeping operations. My delegation congratulates you and the Singapore delegation for your foresight in scheduling this meeting.

Mr. President, your delegation's paper on strengthening cooperation with troop-contributing countries has served to focus our discussion. It underscored the fact that troop-contributing countries are perhaps the most indispensable element of any peacekeeping operation and that the relationship between troop-contributing countries, the Security Council and the Secretariat is of paramount importance. As was indicated in your delegation's paper, the main purpose of this open debate is to provide all participants in United Nations peacekeeping with an opportunity to reflect on recent experiences, with a view to distilling some lessons that can be learned.

We have had an opportunity to listen to the concerns and the recommendations of some of the troop-contributing countries. My delegation thanks them for sharing their experiences and for contributing constructive and useful suggestions. Indeed, Jamaica fully supports any initiative in the Security Council that is aimed at improving the process of consultations between the Security Council and troop-contributing countries. My delegation's contribution in the examination of the Brahimi report and our subsequent support for the adoption of the working group's recommendations on consultations with troop-contributing countries aptly demonstrate our commitment to this undertaking. The Council's debate last November under the presidency of the Netherlands on issues related to peacekeeping exit strategies was a further illustration of the seriousness with which the Security Council views all matters related to United Nations peacekeeping operations.

The working group on the Brahimi report examined mechanisms and procedures for strengthening consultations with both current and potential troop-contributing countries. It also considered how that might be done before and after the establishment of a peacekeeping mission, particularly on matters affecting the safety and security of personnel and the implications for a mission's use of force. As a result of that examination, the working group made certain specific recommendations to the Security Council.

By adopting resolution 1327 (2000) on 13 November 2000, and by approving thereby the annexed decisions and recommendations, the Council has in fact embraced a new doctrine on peacekeeping operations. That new doctrine sets specific, unambiguous goals for United Nations peacekeeping. In that new doctrine the Council's relationship and the level of consultations with troop-contributing countries are given full and unqualified attention.

The decisions set out in the annex to resolution 1327 (2000) are very clear as to the Council's objectives relating specifically to troop-contributing countries. They include the importance of an improved system of consultations among troop-contributing countries, the Secretariat and the Security Council. The stated purpose is to foster a common understanding of the situation on the ground to which peacekeepers are sent, and that all concerned are cognizant of the mission's mandate and the requirements for its implementation.

Most importantly, the Council agreed to strengthen significantly the existing system of consultations through the holding of private meetings with troop-contributing countries in a form and with a content conducive to making such meetings more interactive and productive. In that regard, a number of troop-contributing countries have made important recommendations during the course of this debate on how best to achieve optimum results. Their recommendations merit our serious consideration.

Also of significance is the fact that under its new doctrine, troop-contributing countries may initiate those meetings with the Security Council. Furthermore, after being identified by the Secretary-General, potential troop contributors may also request a meeting with the Security Council in the case of a new or ongoing peacekeeping operation, during the implementation phase of an operation, and when the Council is considering a change in, or renewal or completion of, a peacekeeping mandate. The process of consultation must be ongoing and must provide troop-contributing countries with the option to initiate such meetings, even if meetings are not contemplated by the Security Council. Most importantly, a troop contributor must have the opportunity to seek such a meeting with the Council when a rapid deterioration in the situation on the ground threatens the safety and security of its troops.

By resolving to give peacekeeping operations clear, credible and achievable mandates, the Security Council has committed itself to removing all doubts as to what is expected of troop contributors before their personnel are deployed. When clearly understood, each

mandate must pre-determines the level of training and equipment required for a peacekeeping operation. When time is of the essence, there is also an obligation for those countries participating in the standby arrangements whose troops are adequately trained and equipped to be ready to respond at short notice when needed for peacekeeping operations. The success or failure of a peacekeeping operation could be determined by the speed with which peacekeepers are deployed.

The Security Council's relationship with troop-contributing countries extends beyond ensuring that we do it right when going in. We have debated the imperatives for an appropriate exit strategy for each mission, and, with the United Nations embarking on increasingly complex peacekeeping missions, the role of peacekeepers has taken on new dimensions. Bearing in mind that the transition from peacekeeping to peace-building is a process and not an event, let us note that peacekeepers are uniquely placed to ensure that this process takes place in a secured environment.

As the Permanent Representative of Japan emphasized to us this morning, many of these missions involve large civilian components, and we agree that it is crucial for the Council to listen to those countries that make contributions of civilians, logistics and equipment. This was taken up in S/PRST/1996/13. We need to ensure that it is fully implemented.

The Security Council, by adopting resolution 1327 (2000), has clearly stated its intentions with respect to troop-contributing countries and the process of consultations during all phases of a peace operation. It is, however, of far more importance that the actions taken or contemplated by the Council give effect to this new doctrine. The Security Council has already acted to improve the level of consultations. Recent meetings between the Council and troop-contributing countries have afforded a greater exchange of views than has been the case in the recent past. Currently, the Security Council is considering the establishment of a committee on peacekeeping operations, to deal specifically with areas of peacekeeping falling within the jurisdiction of the Security Council. The President of the Council, in his wisdom, has asked troop-contributing countries for their comments on this initiative during the course of this debate. My delegation has listened carefully to the comments made here today, and this will assist us in developing the terms of reference for the peacekeeping committee, to ensure its effectiveness in improving the work of the Security Council.

My delegation fully supports the establishment of mechanisms and procedures within the Council which will enhance its ability to carry out peacekeeping operations, including consultations with troop-contributing countries. We must work, collectively and individually, to make the process work better.

Jamaica is determined that the lessons of the past must teach us the way of the future. Without seeking to ascribe responsibility for failures or give credit for successes, we are fully committed to playing our part in helping the United Nations avoid repeating the mistakes of the past while preparing ourselves for future peacekeeping operations based on a cooperative relationship between the Security Council, troop-contributing countries and the Secretariat. We must put our words into action.

Mr. Chowdhury (Bangladesh): It is an honour for us to have you, Mr. Foreign Minister, presiding over the Council today. We are grateful to the Singapore presidency for taking the initiative in arranging this debate on a theme that is very relevant to the work of the Council and closely connected to the maintenance of international peace and security. We also applaud the Singapore presidency for the format of today's meeting: giving an opportunity to the troop-contributing countries (TCCs) to present their views ahead of the Council members. We find that some TCCs will speak later, and we hope that their views, too, will be taken into account. We are very grateful to Ambassador Mahbubani for providing a comprehensive background paper facilitating today's deliberations.

This morning, your own opening statement, Mr. President, and that of the Deputy Secretary-General, Louise Fréchette, elaborated effectively the fundamental issues of our debate. The question of cooperation with troop-contributing countries has assumed greater significance with the evolving nature of United Nations peace operations. As a major troop-contributing country, with two decades of experience in different parts of the world, Bangladesh naturally attaches substantial importance to strengthening the collaboration of the TCCs with the Council and the Secretariat. We have found the statements made by TCCs to be full of useful ideas and assessments. These statements and those of others deserve to be reflected

in a presidential statement, the issuance of which Bangladesh will support.

As a policy issue, we are strongly in favour of involving TCCs in the decisions of the Council, as per the provisions of Article 44 of the Charter of the United Nations. The Council's commitment to this effect was expressed in November 1994 and March 1996 presidential statements.

As for the format of such consultations, the two presidential statements envisaged three types of meetings: the regular Council-TCC-Secretariat meetings, ad hoc or emergency consultations between the Council and the Secretariat, and TCC-Secretariat meetings for briefings by special representatives of the Secretary-General and force commanders. It was, however, specified that these arrangements were not exclusive and could effectively take a variety of forms, including informal communication by the TCCs with the Council's President and its members.

Further, the Council, in its resolution 1327 (2000) of 13 November 2000, made specific provisions for the substantive improvement of these consultations as an institutional mechanism for strengthening cooperation. These provisions, coming as part of the follow-up to the Brahimi report, are particularly important. In the resolution, the Council decided that the existing system of consultations should be strengthened significantly; such consultations will be held through private meetings with troop-contributing countries; these meetings can be held, inter alia, at the request of a TCC; and these consultations will take place at different stages of an operation, and in particular when a change in a peacekeeping mandate is being considered. The objective of such consultations is to foster a common understanding of the situation on the ground, of the mission's mandate and of its implementation.

Clearly, the necessary provisions are there. We have to see their implementation in practice. We recognize that improvements have been made in the Council-TCC-Secretariat consultations over the years. The experience of the recent past, however, shows that there is a serious need for further progress in implementing relevant decisions and in making use of the existing mandated mechanism. Improving interaction — and I mean substantive interaction with the TCCs — is at the heart of our peacekeeping reform.

It is important to note that, in its follow-up to the Brahimi report, the Council has resolved to give peacekeeping operations clear, credible and achievable mandates. We have also recognized the critical importance of peacekeeping operations having, where appropriate and within their mandates, a credible deterrent capability. The Council has also committed itself to ensure that the mandated tasks of peacekeeping operations are appropriate to the situation on the ground. The implementation of these commitments will meet some of the fundamental concerns of the TCCs. The adoption of resolution 1327 (2000) has not brought substantive changes in the practice as yet. Our task here is to see to it that the Council commitments do not become empty rhetoric.

We have heard very loud and clear the concerns and the views of the TCCs. Sharing many of the views expressed here by them, and based on our own experience as a TCC and as a current Council member, we urge action in five areas.

First, the substantive content and nature of the Secretariat briefing must be in line with the letter and spirit of Council resolution 1327 (2000). The Secretariat should go beyond generally available information and analysis of situations. The TCCs should be taken into confidence. Political briefings should include a frank assessment of the developments, and they should tell the TCCs what they need to know. Military briefings by the Secretariat should include concept of operations and should report on key military factors such as chain of command, force structure, unity and cohesion of the force, training and equipment, risk assessment and rules of engagement.

The presidential statements that have been mentioned provide for the circulation of an informal paper or background information prior to the holding of such meetings. In addition, many TCCs feel that, if need be, the Secretariat should share briefing notes informally with them.

Secondly, Council-TCC-Secretariat consultations should be in a format that allows for the free exchange of views in a truly interactive manner. It should continue to be possible for the TCCs to exchange views with the Council through its President. Many TCCs at the meeting this morning favoured the setting up of a practical and worthwhile mechanism for consultation between the TCCs and the Security Council, in line with the Brahimi Panel recommendations. We believe

that there is a lot of merit in the proposal to set up an ad hoc subsidiary organ of the Council for effective participation of the TCCs in the decision-making process of the Council. We would favour the inclusion of this proposal in a presidential statement that the Council could adopt as a follow-up to this debate.

Thirdly, we should recognize TCCs as concerned parties in respect of a given conflict area with regard to the issues, including the question of calling for a Council meeting.

Fourthly, let me touch on Council follow-up of the consultations with the TCCs. Under the existing practice, the President is required to give to the Council, in the course of informal consultations, a summary of the views expressed at each meeting with the TCCs. Council Presidents have been making only brief references to such meetings. We believe that there is room for more substantive discussion in the Council on the content of such meetings. Secretariat support for keeping a record of such meetings should be made available as necessary.

Fifthly and finally, we should provide peace operations, where necessary, with contingency arrangements. We feel that missions in volatile situations should, from the beginning, have a contingency plan with the necessary provisions and facilities.

This last point brings me to the question of the gap in troop commitment. This constitutes a major concern for many countries, including potential troop contributors. As recognized in resolution 1327 (2000), addressing this problem will require the assumption of this shared responsibility by all Member States. Members of the Council, in particular the permanent members, cannot shy away from assuming their own. Bangladesh has proposed that the permanent members contribute 5 per cent of the troops of all peacekeeping missions, thereby showing that they intend to live up to their Charter responsibility. Consultation cannot be meaningful unless there is real partnership. Procedural refinements, as we said before, cannot resolve the substantive problem of the commitment gap.

We see Council-TCC-Secretariat consultation as part of a continuous exercise in the decision-making process on United Nations peacekeeping operations. Better consultation mechanisms involving TCCs at different stages of Council decisions on peacekeeping missions would certainly provide the key to avoiding some of the difficulties experienced in the recent past. The lessons learned should guide us through our future actions.

Mr. Kuchynski (Ukraine): At the outset, let me join previous speakers in welcoming you, Mr. Minister, and in congratulating the Singapore presidency on convening today's open debate on a very important and practical issue — strengthening cooperation with troop-contributing countries (TCCs). We would also like to thank the delegation of Singapore for preparing an excellent and thought-provoking background paper for this meeting. The wide response of Member States, in particular troop contributors, to this topic testifies to its significance, and, I am sure, will contribute to fostering the efficiency of United Nations peacekeeping.

My delegation approaches today's topic from a number of perspectives. From the point of view of its substance, we firmly believe that close cooperation between troop-contributing countries, the Security Council and the Secretariat is a decisive factor in conducting peacekeeping operations, at all of their stages, in the most effective manner possible. The role of each player in this triangle is indispensable, and therefore the importance of the right relationship between them, as well as an adequate level of understanding, mutual support and trust, cannot be overestimated. Obviously, some recent failures of United Nations peacekeeping prove that much has yet to be done to remedy the situation.

From the point of view of timing, today's discussion is being held at a most appropriate moment, given the continuous increase in United Nations peacekeeping in recent years and the growing need to expand and improve the consultative process and cooperation with the TCCs. It should be noted that last year alone, the number of United Nations peacekeepers deployed around the globe almost tripled and that the number of troop-contributing countries reached 88. Our debate acquires additional relevance in the light of the ongoing process of the reform of the United Nations peacekeeping mechanism, which was brought about by the Brahimi report and endorsed by the Millennium Summit and Security Council resolution 1318 (2000).

From the point of view of our own national experience as a troop contributor and a Security Council member, Ukraine would note that it has been involved in United Nations peacekeeping operations

for over eight years. About 13,000 military and civilian personnel from my country have discharged their noble duty for the cause of peace in 21 United Nations peacekeeping operations and missions around the globe. Last year alone, my country increased 23-fold its contribution in personnel to newly established or ongoing peacekeeping operations. As a matter of fact, there was no operation going on in 2000 without Ukraine's participation. Currently, over 1,400 representatives of my country are serving with 10 United Nations peacekeeping operations and missions.

Ukraine fully shares the widespread perception that the existing mechanism of consultations between the troop contributors, the Security Council and the Secretariat needs to be further streamlined and institutionalized. All necessary measures should be undertaken to ensure that the troop contributors are consulted at all stages of the operations. Against this background, we are largely satisfied with the real progress achieved in this field following the adoption of Security Council resolution 1327 (2000) and General Assembly resolution 55/135, both of which endorsed the recommendations of the Brahimi report. We attach great importance to the speedy and effective implementation of these resolutions. At the same time, we agree that the new arrangements formalized in that Security Council resolution have not been fully implemented.

We would also like to note with particular satisfaction an innovative step undertaken under the Jamaican presidency last July, when a meeting of the Security Council with the TCCs was called to discuss a draft resolution on the impact of HIV/AIDS on peacekeeping operations. Similarly, in our view, it would also be wise for all participants in the process to continue making full use of the procedures set out in the statement by the President of the Security Council of 4 November 1994 (S/PRST/1994/62) and of 28 March 1996 (S/PRST/1996/13), many of which are still relevant today.

My delegation regards as an achievement the formalization in resolution 1327 (2000) of a new type of private meeting with troop contributors in the format of the 4 October 2000 meeting on the United Nations Mission in Sierra Leone. In our view, this model of consultations, in the form of interactive and informal exchange of views between the TCCs and the Security Council members after substantive briefings by the Secretariat, should be followed in the future.

In the context of Security Council resolution 1327 (2000), we place special importance on the provision that such private meetings with TCCs be held at the latter's request. For us, the right of a troop-contributing country to request such private meetings, especially in cases of rapid deterioration of the security situation on the ground, is particularly meaningful and sensitive. Ukraine's history of participation in United Nations peacekeeping operations includes at least four such cases in which its peacekeepers were held hostages in zones of conflict.

In our view, improvements in the practice of TCC meetings, and thus of cooperation with them, can be made by all partners in the process. First of all, this relates to the troop contributors themselves. It is evident that the effectiveness of these meetings depends on their readiness and willingness to hold an active dialogue with the Security Council members and the Secretariat.

The active participation of Security Council members in such meetings is also extremely important to ensure that the Council issues clearly defined, credible and achievable mandates for peacekeeping operations, taking into account the views, advice and expertise of TCCs.

The Secretariat's role in the process of consultations with the TCCs could also be improved, in our view, through regular briefings at a higher level of expertise and analysis and the circulation of informal background papers well in advance. We feel that more frequent invitations to TCC meetings of commanders of peacekeeping operations and/or special representatives of the Secretary-General could also be very productive.

As regards other mechanisms to strengthen the link between the Security Council and TCCs, we think that the idea of creating a working group of the Council on peacekeeping operations to address these issues deserves our further consideration. My delegation stands ready to discuss this idea in practical terms.

Finally, we believe that the presentations made earlier today, which contained profound analysis and an array of very practical suggestions, will become the subject of very careful study by Council members. We hope that the implementation of these proposals will create a new basis for increased cooperation between the Security Council, the troop contributors and the

Secretariat. My delegation intends to continue its worthy contribution to this lofty task.

Mr. Gatilov (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): We welcome you, Mr. President, to today's meeting, and we are grateful to the delegation of Singapore for choosing this item for our discussion today. This will certainly help us improve United Nations peacekeeping potential.

We agree with the general view that strengthening various forms of cooperation with the troop-contributing countries is an important way of enhancing the effectiveness of United Nations peacekeeping. This should be the main objective of our common endeavour.

A series of steps has recently been taken in this direction, which include, most notably, the report of the Panel of experts under Ambassador Brahimi and, subsequently, Security Council resolutions 1318 (2000) and 1327 (2000), as well as General Assembly resolution 55/135. It is significant that these documents confirm the Security Council's primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. From that perspective, they have defined specific ways of improving our interaction with troop contributors.

In preparing for today's meeting, we analysed the criticism often voiced against the Security Council in this connection. It seems to us that we could define the criticism as follows: first, complaints that meetings with troop contributors are not held in a timely manner, particularly in cases of deteriorating situations on the ground for peacekeeping operations; secondly, complaints about inadequate information provided by the United Nations Secretariat; and thirdly, complaints about the absence of assurances that the views of contributors will be taken into account by the Security Council when it prepares the relevant decisions.

We believe that the specific measures agreed in the past half year are in fact geared towards resolving these matters. It is not important what words are used to describe the efforts we are making to improve interaction with the troop-contributing countries. It can be called institutionalization or formalization, but the main point is how useful the impact of our activities will be.

It is primarily a question of the Security Council's willingness to strengthen significantly the existing system of consultation by holding closed or private meetings with troop-contributing countries, including at their request, without detriment to the Security Council's established rules of procedures. We believe that this will help resolve this issue of having timely meetings.

As for inadequate information, we believe that the Secretariat, through the statement made by the Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations, Mr. Guéhenno, in November 2000, in the Fourth Committee of the General Assembly, expressed its willingness to deal with this complaint. We hope that carrying out that obligation that he voiced will meet the legitimate concerns of the troop-contributing countries.

As for assurances that Member States' views will be taken into account in decision-making on deploying peacekeeping operations, we must realize that no one has any such assurances, including the Council members, for decisions taken in the Security Council are, as a rule, the result of a compromise that is reached, and everybody must concede a little in order to achieve the main objective.

This problem requires serious reflection. In this connection, we thought that the following possible action might be considered.

National contingents of troop contributors in a peacekeeping operation might make use of the experience they have acquired on the ground and report their views about any particular aspect of the conduct of the operation to the force commander and to the Secretary-General's special representative, who would then take this information into account in preparing the relevant reports of the Secretary-General to the Security Council. It is no secret that it is those reports, as experience has shown, that are the real catalyst for introducing any changes in the mandates of peacekeeping operations. We believe that this would be an effective approach. It would work, and we further believe it would not involve additional bureaucratization of decision-making in the Council. We could thus have a new mechanism for interaction with troop contributing countries, namely, meetings of the members of the Council, the troop contributors and the Secretariat in a new format, more in-depth briefings from the Secretariat and feedback from the national contingents in a peacekeeping operation.

Of course, these are just preliminary points, and they may be supplemented, for example, within the

context of discussions in the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations.

We have listened carefully to the statements made by troop-contributing countries, and we note that a number of their proposals as to how to enhance United Nations peacekeeping are in keeping with our approach. Inter alia, we would regard India's proposal on making more use of the Military Staff Committee, in line with resolution 1327 (2000), as an obligation to study ways of exploiting the potential of the Military Staff Committee in the interests of strengthening the peacekeeping activities of the United Nations.

Furthermore, we think that these ideas might be useful in developing interaction with troop contributors. We also think that this proposal and many others that were made could be carefully studied in a working group of the Security Council on peacekeeping issues.

For our part, we wish to confirm our intention to cooperate constructively with all other countries with a view to improving United Nations peacekeeping.

Mr. Ryan (Ireland): I would first like to commend warmly the outgoing members of the Council — Argentina, Canada, Malaysia, Namibia and the Netherlands — for their excellent contribution to the work of the Council over the past two years. As an incoming member of the Council, Ireland is fully committed to carrying out the tasks with which the Member States have entrusted us.

We warmly welcome today's debate under your presidency, Mr. Minister, and we particularly support the format. As was noted by many speakers this morning, this is a very timely initiative of the Singaporean presidency which responds to the concerns of many troop-contributing countries (TCCs) that the Security Council must do more to take into account the views of TCCs.

Ireland associates itself with, and supports, the statement made this morning by Sweden on behalf of the European Union. To those comments, I would like to add the following points in my national capacity.

While the order in which I take the floor today reflects Ireland's current status as a member of the Security Council, that position is a temporary one. This is in contrast to our position as a significant troop contributor, which, over the last 40 years, can reasonably be described as permanent. My remarks reflect, therefore, the interests of both a member of the Security Council and a committed troop contributor.

It is entirely appropriate for the Security Council to discuss in this way with TCCs how their concerns can best be taken on board by the Council. It is vital that the Council engage with and listen to TCCs before taking any decisions affecting the mandate of a peacekeeping operation.

Under Article 24 of the Charter, Member States confer on the Security Council the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security and for carrying this function out on their behalf.

The Security Council has certain obligations under the Charter in this regard. The creation of peacekeeping operations is among the most important of its responsibilities. But, in fulfilling its obligations, the Council also has a responsibility to take into account the views of the countries which contribute troops to those missions.

Troop contributors have a particular concern to ensure that the mandates adopted by the Security Council are clear, credible and achievable. This point should be readily understood by all, including by those Members of the Organization which commit their troops to United Nations command and those which are sometimes reluctant to do so.

The point made earlier by India about the high rate of peacekeepers provided by developing countries is a telling one which should give rise to reflection.

As a contributor to many United Nations missions over the years, Ireland is convinced that we, and other TCCs, can provide essential, practical input into the work of the Council when it is considering the mandate of a mission.

We agree with the Brahimi report that TCCs should be consulted at the very initial stages, and at all stages throughout an operation, most particularly where a change of mandate is involved.

Resolution 1327 (2000) is the most significant element to date in the framework for consultations between the Security Council, the Secretariat and troop contributors.

We take a practical approach to what needs to be done. We look at the useful mechanisms which are already in place, ask how they can be used more

effectively and then question what more needs to be done.

It is important to register that consultations have improved dramatically over the past two years. The new Military Adviser, General Ford, has made a particular contribution since his appointment. The Secretariat must be commended for this effort.

The Military Adviser must continue to brief the Security Council on military matters. The Council needs to have at its disposal the best information available to it when making decisions, and the presence of the Military Adviser is crucial to this requirement.

The Military Adviser should also be available to brief TCCs. Indeed, we welcome the openness and the receptiveness expressed earlier today by Deputy Secretary-General Fréchette on behalf of the Secretariat in this regard.

The Secretariat now circulates their briefing notes to contributors. This is a positive development. We ask that both military and political briefing notes be made available to troop contributors well in advance of consultations and that every effort be made to ensure that briefings are as comprehensive as possible.

We, the States Members of the United Nations and the Secretariat, must draw on lessons learned from recent experiences. We suggest, as a matter of course, that when a mandate is completed, there should be routine discussion with troop contributors, the Council and the Secretariat on lessons learned. The President of the Security Council, representatives of the Secretariat and, importantly, all members of the Council should be present at a senior level at all consultations with troop contributors. This requirement is very usefully reaffirmed in resolution 1327 (2000). I wish to underline the importance that we attach to this.

This requires troop contributors to take the consultations seriously, to be present at an appropriate level and to participate actively. For useful interaction to occur, all sides must become and remain involved. All of this involves resources. The Secretariat requires manpower to respond to all of these demands.

My delegation has been disappointed at the response of the membership to the request of the Secretary-General for resources to implement the recommendations of the Brahimi Panel. During the main segment of this session of the General Assembly, less than half of the posts requested by the Secretary-General were approved. Many of those posts would have improved the quality of service which the Secretariat provides troop contributors and which we demand of the Secretariat. If we are serious about improving United Nations peacekeeping and the manner in which troop contributors are engaged in the system, it follows that we must be prepared to finance the necessary posts. If we are not prepared to accept the recommendations of the Secretary-General as to what he requires to do a better job, there is something hollow in those demands we hear for a greater contribution from the Secretariat.

My delegation has listened very carefully to the debate so far. We have heard several delegations call for the creation of a permanent structure which would allow troop contributors to remain in ongoing dialogue with the Security Council about the preparation, amendment and implementation of peacekeeping mandates in which their troops are involved. We support such a concept and look forward to discussing specific proposals, such as that which Canada intends to bring forward and that which the United Kingdom has proposed.

For our part, we feel that a useful purpose would be served if the Security Council were to put in place a structure for ongoing dialogue with significant troop contributors. This arrangement could operate both vertically, in relation to individual peacekeeping missions, and horizontally, in relation to cross-cutting issues applying to peacekeeping more generally. Picking up the point made by Australia this morning, these new structures should not be burdensome, nor should they affect the ability of the Council to make timely decisions. However, we would not, for the moment, wish to see this mechanism replace the current provisions under which the Council has a formal consultation with troop contributors prior to each mandate renewal.

Many other interesting proposals have been put forward during today's discussions. We look forward to discussing these in more detail with troop contributors and within the Security Council.

Mr. Shen Guofang (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): First of all, the Chinese delegation wishes to express its gratitude to you, Sir, for presiding over this meeting and its appreciation of the efforts made by the delegation of Singapore for its convening.

With a history of more than 50 years, United Nations peacekeeping operations have developed into a comprehensive and complex integrated project. From the United Nations point of view, as the authorizer of peacekeeping operations and the central organ for making decisions on their establishment and deployment and on the development of relevant policies and guidelines, the Security Council is at the heart of all such operations from start to finish. The Secretariat and troop-contributing countries (TCCs) shoulder the important task of implementing the mandates of the Security Council.

For many years, the troop-contributing countries' cooperation in and support for United Nations peacekeeping operations have been an effective guarantee of the Security Council's ability to perform its function of maintaining international peace and security. Their contributions are evident to all. At the same time, there is much room for improvement in terms of coordination with troop-contributing countries. In the case of Sierra Leone in particular, the peacekeeping operation faced more difficulties because of the lack of sufficient consultation and coordination with the troop contributors when the Council changed and adjusted the mandate of the peacekeeping Mission there. This lesson should be learned and remembered well in order better to prevent the recurrence of similar problems in the future.

The success of a peacekeeping operation depends not only on the clear and sound division of work, but also on good communication and cooperation between the decision maker and the task performer. Therefore, the Chinese delegation actively supports the strengthening of cooperation between the Security Council and troop-contributing countries, as well as between the Secretariat and the troop-contributing countries. It maintains that importance should be attached to maintaining regular consultations with troop-contributing countries and to listening to their pertinent views at all stages of the creation and implementation of a peacekeeping operation.

In recent years, Council members have held close consultations with troop-contributing countries in the form of TCC meetings on questions related to peacekeeping operations, which have played a role in ensuring the smooth implementation of peacekeeping operations. We believe that such a mechanism should continue and be improved upon and that, without prejudice to the efficiency of the work of the Security Council, more flexible forms of exchange and communication with troop-contributing countries should be considered in order to inspire free exchanges of views. Troop-contributing countries should also be encouraged to express their concerns to the Council in a more timely and flexible manner. All this should become an important component of the effort to improve the working methods and increase the transparency of the Security Council.

This morning, representatives of the troop-contributing countries raised many questions that deserve the Security Council's consideration. They also made many good suggestions. We hope that there will be follow-up action in this regard.

As to strengthening cooperation between the Secretariat and troop-contributing countries, we support the establishment of closer partnerships between the Secretariat and troop contributors and the Secretariat should do its utmost to provide conveniences to the latter. We would recommend that the Secretariat continue to give timely and accurate briefings to troop-contributing countries, which should be in line with those given to the Security Council. I would emphasize that the Secretariat, in dispatching and deploying peacekeeping operations, has done a great deal of work over the years and that its contribution deserves our commendation.

The Chinese delegation endorses the proposal to establish a Security Council working group on peacekeeping operations. In our view, one of the primary tasks of that working group should be to explore ways to strengthen cooperation between the Security Council, the Secretariat and troop-contributing countries while learning from the successes and failures of recent peacekeeping operations. The scope of the tasks to be dealt with by the working group should include how to improve the content and form of meetings with troop contributors, additional ways to strengthen cooperation between the Council and troop-contributing countries, and how to encourage and give full play to the initiatives of troop-contributing countries.

The working group should also listen to the views of non-members, and to those of troop-contributing countries in particular — and this should be done in a flexible way. The Chinese delegation will take an active part in the endeavours of the working group and will join hands with all Member States — especially

troop-contributing countries — to strengthen cooperation between the Security Council and troop-contributing countries so as to make United Nations peacekeeping operations more effective and successful.

Mr. Kolby (Norway): Norway would like to join other delegations in welcoming this debate. We commend Singapore's initiative, and we commend you, Mr. Minister, for coming to New York to preside over this important meeting.

The United Nations capacity to conduct effective peacekeeping operations is crucial in order for the Security Council to fulfil its primary responsibility for maintaining international peace and security. The Brahimi report has pointed out important challenges in that regard, and includes timely recommendations that have Norway's full support.

Norway remains firmly committed to United Nations peacekeeping and to supporting the primary role of the Security Council with regard to peace and stability. Over 1,200 Norwegian soldiers are serving in United Nations-mandated peace operations today. One per cent of our total civilian police force now serves under the flag of the United Nations. We are working to improve our capacity to participate with military and civilian personnel and resources in ongoing and future United Nations operations.

As an elected Council member and as a troop contributor, Norway is very conscious of the need for close cooperation between the Council, troop-contributing countries and the Secretariat in order for the United Nations to be successful in peacekeeping. We therefore warmly welcome the initiative of Singapore to arrange this open debate. We highly appreciate your presence here today, Mr. President.

In the Council, Norway will continue to advocate transparency and openness towards non-members, in line with Nordic positions on Security Council reform. Improving arrangements for consultations with troop contributors is part and parcel of that effort. This goes to the heart of key issues raised in the Brahimi report: the need for clear, credible and achievable mandates; and the need to close the commitment gap between adopted mandates and available troops and resources.

Norway is adamant that countries providing troops to United Nations peacekeeping operations must be given due opportunities to participate in the preparation and revision of mandates. We need mechanisms that address the legitimate interests of troop contributors during all phases of an operation. That will promote, not hamper, the process of preparing and implementing achievable mandates.

We therefore welcome resolution 1327 (2000), which states the Council's commitment to strengthen significantly the existing system of consultations. While the arrangements established during the 1990s led to obvious improvements for troop-contributors, it nevertheless became clear that closer interaction was needed. The decision to hold private meetings with troop-contributing countries, including at their request, at various stages of peace-keeping operations, is thus an important step. Such meetings should become an integral part of both the Council's and the Secretariat's planning and conduct of peace operations.

We welcome the presidency's initiative to invite troop contributors to consultations prior to the Secretary-General's release of his new report on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon. This is a practical initiative that is in accordance with what we are debating here today.

It is now up to all of us — troop contributors, Council members and non-members alike — to make maximum use of the joint meetings with the Secretariat in order to utilize their potential for successful interaction, decision-making input and information-sharing. This requires the active participation of all parties involved at the appropriate level.

Looking ahead, we believe that due consideration should be given to the proposal of the Brahimi Panel to establish ad hoc subsidiary organs of the Security Council, as provided for in Article 29 of the Charter, as a way to institutionalize troop-contributing countries' advice to the Council during the mandate-formulation process. Due consideration should also be given to the possibility that regional organizations taking part in United Nations peace operations with coordinated forces could participate in consultations with the Council and troop-contributing countries.

We are ready to consider proposals to establish a more permanent mechanism under the Security Council in order to follow-up the recommendations of the Brahimi report and other issues related to peacekeeping. Troop contributors must be provided with satisfactory ways of participating in such a follow-up effort. We must all strive towards transparency in our work on peacekeeping operations.

Norway believes that countries that have committed military units to an operation should have access to Secretariat briefings to the Security Council during the existence of an operation on matters affecting the security of their personnel. In order for the Secretariat to fulfil the crucial task of providing information to troop-contributing countries, it must be given the necessary resources to gather, analyse and distribute relevant information in a timely manner. This is of no little importance to smaller countries with limited information-gathering capacities of their own. We must strengthen the planning capacity of the Secretariat in order to provide troop-contributing countries with the necessary material as a basis for decision-making.

Norway welcomes the actions already taken in the Security Council, the General Assembly and the Secretariat to follow-up the Brahimi report. I have listened very carefully to the legitimate concerns and concrete proposals presented today by important troop contributors, including Jordan, India, Fiji and Nigeria. Norway is determined to work closely and constructively with them, both in the Council and in the Assembly, and with other members and troop contributors to ensure implementation of the Panel's recommendations.

In conclusion, my delegation would also like to thank all the outgoing members of the Council for their contributions to the work of the Council during the past two years.

Mr. Levitte (France) (*spoke in French*): France associates itself fully with the statement made earlier today by the Permanent Representative of Sweden on behalf of the European Union. I would like to review briefly some of the items that in our judgement are essential to understanding the stakes involved in this issue, from the Security Council's point of view.

First of all I would like to thank you, Mr. President, for having organized this debate two months after the adoption of resolution 1327 (2000). The views expressed by the troop-contributing countries earlier today provide us with a good idea of the best way to put into practice the commitments we made under that resolution.

I will not reprise in detail the reasons why it is indispensable to enhance consultations between the Council and the troop-contributing countries at every stage of the preparations for and conduct of peacekeeping operations. Such cooperation in fact makes it possible to increase the unity of purpose of operations and cohesiveness in their conduct. This cooperation must promote a shared understanding of the objectives and of the risks involved, as well as of the strategies to be implemented to successfully carry out peacekeeping operations. The willingness of troop-contributing countries to commit their troops in the field depends on such cooperation. As the Brahimi report forcefully recalls,

> "The Security Council and the Secretariat also must be able to win the confidence of troop contributors that the strategy and concept of operations for a new mission are sound." (*S/2000/809, para. 52*)

We know well that such confidence can be cultivated only through a genuine partnership between the Council which decides on mandates, in keeping with its responsibilities under the Charter, and the troop-contributing countries, which implement these mandates. There are several possible approaches to seeking such a partnership.

I would like to recall first the very useful role that groups of friends play when such groups are open and when they bring together the members of the Council, the main troop contributors, the countries of the region and possibly foreign donors as well. For instance, throughout the existence of the United Nations Mission in the Central African Republic (MINURCA) the Group of Friends of the Central African Republic, which brings together all these different categories of countries, has made it possible to share information and to have a shared understanding of the stakes and objectives of the mission, of the situation on the ground and of the relationship with the Central African authorities. I am convinced that the existence and work of this Group have been one of the factors in the success of MINURCA.

Secondly, the meetings between all the Council members and all the troop contributors are the standard approach to such a partnership. I listened closely to the criticisms that several Member States made earlier concerning the often pro forma and not very useful character of these meetings. I understand their frustrations, and I must say that I share their opinions. For my part, over the past few months I have argued in favour of organizing, more and more systematically, private meetings with the troop-contributing countries,

along the lines of the meeting that the Council held on 4 October for the United Nations Mission in Sierra Leone (UNAMSIL).

That was an exemplary meeting in our opinion, because three conditions were met. First, the members of the Council and the main troop contributors were represented at a level of high responsibility. Secondly, the information provided by the Secretariat concerning the situation and the possibilities was the same information that had been given to the Council members the day before during consultations. Thirdly, an interactive, candid and substantial dialogue — without pointless formalities — ensued between the Council members and the troop contributors. If all the meetings with troop contributors were to proceed in this manner, I think that many of the frustrations expressed today would fade away.

Several Member States have suggested that subsidiary bodies of the Council be established to better organize consultation between the Security Council and the troop contributors. This idea should be examined with an open mind, while remaining aware — as I have just said regarding the meeting of 4 October — that what matters is not so much the formal machinery as the use to which it is put.

In conclusion, I would like to respond to troop-contributing Member States — I am thinking in particular of India, which made a brilliant statement, and Jordan and some others — that lamented that there are members of the Council that have not committed themselves to contributing troops under the same conditions as other States. The French delegation did not take this criticism personally. France has participated in many United Nations peacekeeping operations. In 1993, it was even the leading contributor worldwide, with more than 9,000 personnel engaged. With 98 deaths and hundreds of wounded, France is, after India, the country that has given the greatest number of lives to the service of peacekeeping. Today France is participating in 10 United Nations operations and in two additional operations authorized by the Security Council — in Bosnia and Kosovo. In all, more than 8,700 military staff and 200 police are participating directly in the implementation of Security Council mandates. These few statistics are enough to demonstrate that France has good reasons to understand the concerns of troop contributors, and, along with all the members of the Council, France wishes to respond to these concerns as effectively as possible.

Mr. Valdivieso (Colombia) (*spoke in Spanish*): I would like to offer you, Sir, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Singapore, the greetings of my delegation and to tell you how pleased we are to see you presiding over this meeting. I would like to highlight the importance of this open debate, as well as the approach of hearing first from the troop-contributing countries and then from the members of the Security Council.

Earlier today we heard several delegations' statements on this topic. In this statement we propose to refer to some of the ideas that were raised. We would like to express thanks for the words of welcome that several representatives and meeting participants addressed to those of us who are new Council members.

In most cases the member countries of the Security Council and the troop-contributing countries are not the same. This is why it is necessary, first, that the Security Council establish permanent, appropriate and relevant mechanisms for involving troop-contributing countries. Secondly, those countries should take proper advantage of these mechanisms. This morning one delegation referred to a lack of active participation on the part of the troop-contributing countries during the regular consultations.

Each mission authorized by the Security Council should develop its own mechanisms for cooperation and consultation with the troop-contributing countries. In some cases, a routine meeting would suffice. In other, more complex situations, it would be necessary to resort to more sophisticated consultation mechanisms, which could be developed and fine-tuned with experience.

We would like to reiterate what was stated by several delegations this morning: that consultations should be convened with enough lead time and should be announced in the *Journal*, so that the decisions taken by the Council could benefit from the viewpoints expressed by countries prepared to provide troops to peacekeeping operations. We would therefore recommend that every report of the Secretary-General to the Security Council on developments affecting missions in the field include his assessment of consultations being held with the troop-contributing countries, be they actual or potential contributors.

We would like also to express our support for reviving the Military Staff Committee, with a broadened mandate that would reflect the concerns voiced this morning, failing which we should establish a standing institutional mechanism for consultation and cooperation with the troop-contributing countries.

I should now like to touch on the importance of promoting closer cooperation between the Security Council and countries that are potential troop contributors. I believe that the Council should ask itself whether it is doing everything to motivate Members of the United Nations to become troop contributors. It goes without saying that consultations with potential contributors would have to be different from those held with countries that are already contributing troops. In the former case, it is a matter of presenting a potential contributor with enough information to motivate it to participate. Clearly, the work of the Security Council should be more proactive.

Why do some countries not contribute troops? In some cases, internal security issues constrain contribution, and clearly there is little that the Security Council can do to counteract such a sovereign decision. However, there are other cases in which internal political pressures prevent a State from becoming a contributor, and there may even be cases in which such a decision is not taken because of a lack of information.

In the latter cases, the Security Council, in coordination with the Secretariat, could have a positive influence if it were to be more active. It could, for instance, circulate information on the proposed mission, the means available to achieve its aims, and the risks and benefits involved in participating in its implementation. National Governments should have the necessary information to be able to justify publicly their decision to contribute troops, observers or equipment. To this end, the Secretariat could work more actively with the missions to ensure that information is properly channelled to capitals.

In conclusion, I should like to stress the timeliness of consultations, a matter referred to by several delegations this morning. Troop-contributing countries must be consulted at the beginning of a mission, when there are proposed changes to its mandate, when new components are introduced into it, and whenever it becomes necessary to modify the rules of engagement.

We feel that these circumstances should define a minimum level of consultation for streamlined management of the peacekeeping operations authorized by the Security Council. The Council should cultivate a relationship of mutual trust with troop-contributing countries, which will help to prevent the taking of unilateral decisions by troops and bring about greater cohesion among the forces deployed in the field.

Mr. Neewoor (Mauritius): We commend Singapore for its initiative to hold this open debate today on the important subject of strengthening cooperation with troop-contributing countries (TCCs). Mr. Minister, we deeply appreciate your presence in the Council and the fact that you are presiding over the discussions on this important subject.

Allow me also to thank all of the delegations that have addressed kind words of felicitations to us following our recent election to the Security Council to serve a two-year term as a non-permanent member. I would like to assure all delegations that Mauritius is determined to contribute effectively to the work of the Council and to bring its perspective to the deliberations, keeping in mind the common concerns and aspirations of the general membership of the United Nations.

We also thank the outgoing members of the Council, namely Argentina, Canada, Malaysia, Namibia and the Netherlands, for their contribution to the work of the Council during their tenure.

I wish to take this opportunity to first of all express the appreciation of my delegation to all of the troop-contributing countries for making their troops available so that the United Nations can fulfil its fundamental task of maintaining peace and security throughout the world. We are conscious of the great sacrifice the TCCs make in deploying their men and women in conflict situations in unfamiliar territories on behalf of the United Nations. We believe that there can be no doubt whatsoever that TCCs, which risk the lives of their personnel, must be fully involved in the decision-making process at every stage of a mandate that concerns them.

During the morning session, we listened to statements by a number of important TCCs, which not only expressed their concerns about the numerous problems peacekeeping operations entail, but also made many valuable suggestions to improve the situation.

The traumatic experience of the United Nations in failing to prevent genocide in Rwanda in 1994 and to protect the inhabitants of Srebrenica ultimately triggered the setting up of the independent high-level Panel to undertake a thorough review of United Nations peacekeeping operations. Today we have the Brahimi report, which is an important road map that will enable our Organization to achieve better results from more effective peacekeeping operations in the coming years.

It goes without saying that greater cooperation between TCCs, the Secretariat and the Security Council should yield better results for our peacekeeping operations. The success and increased efficiency of any peacekeeping operation can be ensured through effective coordination and management involving all concerned parties. The Brahimi report has clearly recommended greater cooperation between the Security Council and the TCCs. The Security Council affirmed in resolution 1318 (2000) its determination, at the level of heads of State and Government, to adopt clearly defined, credible, achievable and appropriate mandates. Through resolution 1327 (2000), the Security Council confirmed its commitment to holding private meetings with TCCs at various stages of the establishment and implementation of peacekeeping operations.

The holding of these private meetings is undoubtedly marked progress towards greater cooperation between the Council and the TCCs. However, we Security Council members need to address seriously the calls and concerns we heard from TCCs earlier in this meeting, particularly with regard to the legitimate request regarding the institutionalization of Security Council and TCC cooperation.

We fully subscribe to the view that the Security Council should consult with TCCs during the formulation of mandates. Today the majority of troops come from developing countries because developed countries are more and more reluctant to risk their military personnel abroad. We in the Security Council cannot afford to see a dwindling of troops from developing countries as well in the years ahead, especially when everyone knows that more and more peacekeeping operations are being undertaken by the United Nations. The concerns of TCCs should be taken very seriously.

My delegation wishes to join with other delegations which have, over the years and today also, advocated the institutionalization of consultations between TCCs and the Security Council through the establishment of an ad hoc subsidiary organ of the Council, as provided for in Article 29 of the Charter. This matter should be fully discussed within the Council at an early date.

TCCs have an important role to play since their military contingents are called upon to discharge responsibilities professionally, in accordance with the mission's mandate. Although the Security Council is largely responsible for designing peacekeeping operations, the implementation of the mandate of operations rests mainly with the troops deployed on the ground. In the Security Council, we should ensure that TCCs are thoroughly consulted whenever a change in the mandate of an operation is contemplated. This can best be achieved within the ambit of the proposed subsidiary organ. It is true that if TCCs are not consulted in the evolution of a mandate, it will be difficult for the TCCs to have a clear assessment of possible developments on the ground.

The success of any project lies largely in the degree of genuine cooperation and consultation between the project designers and the executants of the project. We believe it is essential to involve TCCs in consultations at the earliest stage possible. During these early consultations, potential TCCs should be provided with the information that would enable them to decide on their eventual participation on the ground.

The Secretariat needs to thoroughly and continually brief TCCs on all aspects, including the situation on the ground, risk assessment of the operation and the security threats involved. At an early stage of consultation, it is also very useful to take on board inputs from the Lessons Learned Unit of the Department of Peacekeeping Operations. These steps would create a better understanding between the Secretariat and TCCs. Only if there is enhanced confidence between all stakeholders will the TCCs be able to convince their national legislatures and public to commit troops.

Peace operations should be well manned and well equipped in order to minimize risks and failures. In this regard, the Secretariat has the prime responsibility of identifying the best trained and most experienced troops for a ground operation. While the Secretariat

should carefully assess the overall preparedness of potential troops prior to deployment, TCCs should also understand that one of the ways to ensure the success of an operation is through the commitment of well-trained contingents, with appropriate equipment and supplies needed to sustain their personnel on the ground. The TCCs and the Department of Peacekeeping Operations should work closely within a framework of military cooperation to ensure that the troops deployed have the optimum capacity to discharge their duties efficiently. Here we agree with the suggestion of India that the Military Staff Committee should be revived.

In conclusion, today's open debate has given us deep insight into the need for greater cooperation between the Security Council, the Secretariat and the TCCs. My delegation has no doubt that the Security Council must seriously address the issues raised by the TCCs and take appropriate measures to accommodate the concerns expressed in this open debate.

Mr. Ouane (Mali) (*spoke in French*): Mali is pleased to see the Security Council meeting under your presidency, Mr. Minister, in this important public debate on strengthening cooperation with troop-contributing countries (TCCs). I wish to thank Ambassador Mahbubani and his team for having taken the initiative of organizing this debate on an issue that is relevant to us all.

My delegation was pleased to see that the countries speaking in this debate represented a very broad range of countries that, like Mali, have participated honourably in United Nations peacekeeping operations throughout the years. It will be very important to take their opinions into account.

Mali would like to contribute to this collective reflection by stressing the following points. First, we think that it is our very real obligation to encourage genuine dialogue with troop-contributing countries. Of course, the process of holding consultations between the Security Council, the Secretariat and the troop contributors means holding meetings in accordance with the guidelines contained in the presidential statements of 4 November 1994 and 28 March 1996.

But there are certain limits in this system, as we can see from the problems encountered by the United Nations Protection Force in the Balkans, the United Nations Operation in Somalia and the United Nations Mission in Sierra Leone. We must find and improve consultation procedures that are in keeping with the Charter and that allow troop contributors to be properly heard when they speak about the possible use of their contingents.

Accordingly, we welcome the adoption of Security Council resolution 1327 (2000) of 13 November 2000 and General Assembly resolution 55/135 of 8 December 2000, which endorsed the recommendations made by the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations with regard to strengthening consultations between the troop contributors, the Security Council and the Secretariat.

As the excellent working paper provided by Singapore for this occasion points out, we must strengthen consultations and exchange of information with troop contributors on peacekeeping operations, including planning, management and coordination. In this connection, we would advocate more public meetings like the one held on 4 October 2000 on UNAMSIL. We agree with the view that in this way we would be able to build up trust that is essential if Member States are to provide the necessary resources and shoulder the risks involved in deploying peacekeepers.

But — and this is my second comment — this very necessary trust must be based on a true partnership between those who decide and those who implement. As has been recalled time and again, this close cooperation was lacking in the case of UNAMSIL, and also in many earlier operations. Drawing lessons from the past, and to prevent any recurrence of crisis, Mali would like us to be able to invoke Articles 43 and 44 of the Charter whenever useful and whenever possible. Basically, it is a question of inviting the Member State providing the armed forces to — and I quote Article 44 — "participate in decisions of the Security Council concerning the employment of contingents of that Member's armed forces". This is what should happen, including in all aspects of planning peacekeeping mission tasks, in the evolution of mandates and with regard to the safety and security of peacekeeping personnel.

Along those same lines I would like to mention here the relations of confidence between the Security Council and the Economic Community of West African States, which they decided to strengthen, to develop, in a spirit of partnership after their meeting on 21 June 2000.

Similarly, we noted with great interest proposals made in the general debate in the Fourth Committee in November 2000 on the question of peacekeeping operations in all its aspects. These proposals have been repeated by their authors here today. In large part we share those views, especially what was said by India, Jordan and Pakistan.

To ensure success for United Nations peacekeeping operations — this is my third and last point — it is important to strengthen the Secretariat's capacity to plan, deploy and conduct operations. Here, we fully support measures recommended in the Brahimi report and supported by the Secretary-General in his implementation report of 20 October 2000.

In conclusion, I would just like to say that as far as Mali is concerned, the United Nations can have no future as a guarantor of international peace and security unless it achieves the triptych of dialogue, partnership and modernization.

The President: The next speaker on my list is the representative of Romania. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Ducaru (Romania): As this is the first time for me to address this distinguished and vital organ of the United Nations, allow me to extend my congratulations to all the newly elected members, particularly the Singapore presidency for the month of January. It is my great pleasure to welcome warmly the initiative of Minister Jayakumar and Ambassador Mahbubani to keep alive a valuable practice by organizing, during its presidency of the Council, an open debate on strengthening cooperation among the Security Council, the Secretary-General and the troop-contributing countries.

We are grateful to the current presidency of the Council, not only for their initiative, which offers us the opportunity to address a crucial issue for the future success of any United Nations peacekeeping operation, but also for the very comprehensive and sound policy papers we were provided with, both as food for thought and as a good starter for our debate.

My country fully endorses the substantive statement presented by the Swedish presidency of the European Union on the importance of strengthening the cooperation with troop-contributing countries. We share the vision that the United Nations, which bears the primary responsibility for maintaining international peace and security, must reinforce its cooperation with regional organizations and institutions, such as the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), which have their own experience and competencies in managing current crises and preventing the eruption of new ones.

During her one-year mandate as OSCE Chair-in-Office, Romania is committed to act towards an improved dialogue and cooperation with the United Nations, which is the Organization which has indeed a unique global vocation, as well as with all the other governmental and non-governmental organizations and institutions which may contribute to solving those problems that Europe is still coping with, especially in its south-eastern corner and the Caucasus.

As a troop-contributing country to several United Nations peacekeeping operations in different parts of the world, Romania attaches a great importance to the recent demarches undertaken by both the Secretary-General and the Security Council aimed at rethinking and reforming the aims and the means to successfully carry out the Organization's missions. We are strongly encouraged to see that some of the recommendations included in the Brahimi report and properly endorsed by the Secretary-General and the Security Council have already been implemented or are on track for implementation.

In our view, while recognizing the importance of the role that is to be played by the major international bodies and the major individual countries, it goes without saying that taking into account the contributions which are brought to the process by all partners represents a precondition for success in conducting multinational operations. We consider that a three-pillar cooperation mechanism among the Secretary-General, the Security Council and the troop-contributing countries needs to be designed. In our opinion, it is high time to move on from a mechanism working on an ad hoc basis to a more structured and institutionalized one that is able to offer more transparency and credibility to our common endeavours. Such a mechanism, meant to provide greater transparency and efficiency in conducting peace operations, should operate from the early stage of designing and adopting the mandate and until the very end of the mission implementation. Welcoming resolution 1327 (2000) of 13 November 2000, in the spirit of that important document, as highlighted in annex I, it is our conviction that the establishment of

this crucial consultation mechanism should take into consideration the views of troop-contributing countries regarding the modalities of functioning before such a structure is institutionalized.

Romania has participated in United Nations peacekeeping operations since April 1991, with a peak momentum reached between September 1995 and July 1997, when almost 1,000 Romanian Blue Helmets were deployed in Angola, making us number eight in the list of troop-contributing countries.

At the same time, I would like to inform you that the new Romanian Government has included among its top priorities the elaboration of a comprehensive strategy concerning the participation of our country in United Nations-led peace operations. The main goal of this strategy, taking into account the recommendations included in the recently adopted report of the special committee on peacekeeping operations in analysing the Brahimi report, is to increase both the quality and the amount of our contributions, as well as to ensure a higher level of readiness, capability and diversity.

The Romanian Government sees our country's participation in United Nations peacekeeping operations not only as a contribution in terms of our commitment towards the world Organization, but also as an important task, meant to facilitate the achievement of some of our political objectives. Making our own contributions to the United Nations efforts towards global and regional peace and security, we are looking forward to increasing Romania's participation in political and military cooperation with the main European and Euro-Atlantic bodies and individual countries belonging to them.

Allow me to recall that Romania was one of the countries that, on the occasion of the Millennium Summit and responding to the call of the Secretary-General to support the reform of United Nations peacekeeping operations, have voluntarily decided to gradually increase their financial contributions to the United Nations peacekeeping budget. That decision, which has been taken in a period of difficult economic transition, emphasizes Romania's will to contribute to the financial burden-sharing efforts of the Member States.

Before concluding my remarks, I would like to say that we fully support the ongoing process aimed at reforming the United Nations peace operations, initiated by the Security Council and the Secretary-General, and we are ready to bring our own ideas reflecting the experience we have accumulated in the field of United Nations-led peace operations.

The President: The next speaker inscribed on my list is the representative of Senegal. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Ka (Senegal) (*spoke in French*): At the outset, allow me to congratulate you, Sir, on the accession of your country, Singapore, to the presidency of the Security Council for this month, which fortuitously marks the onset of your membership in the Council, of the new century and of the new millennium. These coincidences augur well for the Security Council and I wish to seize the opportunity of this first open meeting of the year to wish you and the other members of the Council, particularly the new ones, every success in discharging your difficult and sensitive mission in the service of world peace.

My delegation also wishes to welcome your very timely initiative of devoting this meeting to an exchange of views on the need to strengthen cooperation between the Security Council, the Secretariat and the troop-contributing countries in the context of joining relevant forces to improve the effectiveness and credibility of peacekeeping operations. Such trilateral cooperation has become virtually mandatory today because peacekeeping doctrine has undergone a spectacular evolution in recent years.

A decade ago, the role of United Nations forces in peacekeeping was often confined to separating parties to a conflict in order to monitor and ensure respect for the implementation of a ceasefire or peace agreement between warring States. Such operations were relatively easier to manage because they required much less in terms of material and financial means and human resources.

Nowadays, and most particularly in the past 10 years, the concept of peacekeeping has evolved considerably in confronting a new generation of conflicts and situations that were previously unknown. These multidimensional operations have progressively become the norm. Unfortunately, the United Nations is entering unfamiliar territory in complex situations in which there is not even a clearly defined political and institutional framework, such as in Kosovo or East Timor. This requires the United Nations to be able to strengthen its capacity to carry out such new missions

appropriately, with the support of well-prepared troops credibly equipped to confront often formidable situations.

A developing country such as mine, which has been involved since 1960 in all theatres of operation, is certainly in a good position to appreciate the initiative you have taken, Sir, in a practical quest for the greater effectiveness and credibility of future peacekeeping operations. This is indeed one of the many challenges facing our Organization today.

In document S/2001/21, the delegation of Singapore pertinently draws attention to and summarizes the provisions of the decisions taken by the Security Council on 13 November 2000 and by the General Assembly on 8 December 2000 endorsing the recommendations of the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations on strengthening consultations between troop-contributing countries, the Security Council and the Secretariat. My delegation considers these recommendations, in particular the proposal to establish a Security Council working group on peacekeeping, to be great steps in the right direction. We recognize, however, that, like all human endeavours, they must continue to be supported and accompanied by our common efforts.

Should we not orient ourselves more firmly towards institutionalizing the process of consultations by involving the troop contributors more closely in the consultations from beginning to end, from the preparatory stages to the implementation and conclusion of peacekeeping operations? Such an approach would create a climate of trust and enable certain hesitant countries, once fully briefed, to commit themselves more fully to these operations. To that end, I would suggest the practical implementation of the following recommendations.

Meetings between the members of the Security Council, the Secretariat, the troop-contributing countries and civilian police elements are certainly useful, but should also involve countries that make a substantial contribution to peacekeeping operations, inter alia, by contributing to special trust funds or by providing important logistical equipment or other resources. Consultations should be held regularly with all these actors at every phase of decision-making on the establishment, conduct, assessment and liquidation of peacekeeping operations. Other, regional actors that often play a supporting role in peacekeeping operations should, in our opinion, also feel involved in the drafting of operation mandates.

As I have said, cooperation between the Security Council, the Secretariat and troop-contributing countries should be based on measures to establish trust that allow troop contributors to participate in the drafting of the mandates, which, as the Brahimi report notes, should be clear, credible and achievable.

It would also be advisable to redress the disparities in the Department of Peacekeeping Operations between the nationals of northern countries, which are over-represented, and those of the South, which are troop contributors but are sparsely represented. A better balance in its personnel would make possible a more objective assessment of the concerns of the countries of the South regarding the management of peacekeeping operations.

In our view, the Secretariat should also develop a dossier for each peace mission that contains the names and contact information for the personnel of the Department of Peacekeeping Operations and other agencies and bodies of the United Nations involved in the mission.

The "group of friends" concept, which was established for such missions as those in Guinea-Bissau and the Central African Republic, could make a significant contribution to strengthening tripartite cooperation between the Security Council, troop contributors and the Secretariat. I therefore very much support the suggestions of the Ambassador of France in this regard.

In conclusion, I would like to emphasize that in seeking to strengthen the capacity of the United Nations to carry out future peacekeeping missions appropriately, my delegation supports the proposal of the United Kingdom to set up a technical committee to examine certain aspects of the Brahimi report, whose pertinent recommendations we all welcome.

The President: The next speaker inscribed on my list is the representative of Poland. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Stańczyk (Poland): It is my pleasure to congratulate you, Mr. President, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council. I would also like to express our gratitude to you for convening this debate and for providing us with an excellent

background paper, which we find extremely timely and useful.

Poland has associated itself with the statement made on behalf of the European Union. Given the importance of the subject being discussed at this debate, I would like to offer a few comments of our own.

The search for ways to improve the effectiveness of United Nations peacekeeping has covered many areas. One pertains to cooperation with troop-contributing countries, particularly within the framework of relationships with the two other partners: the Security Council and the Secretariat of the United Nations. The significance of this issue has been highlighted by the recently increased involvement of the United Nations in peacekeeping and, more importantly, by the wider range of tasks performed within multifunctional peace operations.

For our part, Poland has made every effort to have our cooperation reach the highest standards, both in quantitative and qualitative terms. Throughout our 27 years of involvement in United Nations peacekeeping, 32,000 Polish soldiers, civilian police and other civilian specialists have served under the blue banner. Currently, approximately 1,100 Poles perform their duties in United Nations-led missions, and almost 1,300 do so in other missions mandated by the United Nations Security Council.

Given modest budgetary possibilities, those figures represent the limits of our capacity. Nevertheless, we continue to support United Nations peacekeeping efforts, and we try, at least symbolically, to respond positively when called upon by the Secretary-General by providing additional individual military and police officers or other civilian specialists. Last year, a Polish special police unit 115 strong was deployed in the United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK). We are currently exploring possibilities of contributing other civilian specialists, including prison guards, border guards and customs officers.

Through bilateral and multilateral cooperation with our neighbours and regional partners we continue to improve both our knowledge and our experience in peacekeeping. In this context, let me mention that Polish-Lithuanian and Polish-Ukrainian battalions have been established for the purpose of participating jointly in peacekeeping operations and in the initiative on the Multinational Stand-by Forces High-Readiness Brigade (SHIRBRIG), which for some time now has been developed by a group of interested countries. Poland currently occupies the chairmanship of SHIRBRIG's steering committee. The concept to form and develop the Brigade is recognized in the Brahimi report as a possible model solution for enhancing United Nations capacity for rapid deployment and effective action. We are pleased to note the successful deployment of SHIRBRIG in the United Nations Mission in Ethiopia and Eritrea.

Poland is proud of its achievements in fulfilling its commitments, which — and I wish to state it clearly — would not be possible without good cooperation with the United Nations, particularly the Secretariat.

We share the opinion that the consultation mechanism is a cornerstone of cooperation between troop-contributing countries, the Security Council and the Secretariat. We welcome efforts to make consultations more meaningful and substantive. In that regard, we view the outcome of the deliberations on the recommendations of the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations, including the Security Council's adoption of resolution 1327 (2000), as positive developments.

As a troop contributor we would be interested in the views of Security Council members and other troop-contributing countries, especially with regard to the formulation of the mandate of a new peacekeeping operation or when there is discussion on changing the mandate of an ongoing operation in which Poland is a participant. Furthermore, we would welcome being consulted when decisions are made that affect the safety and security of peacekeepers. At the same time, we would wish to have our views known during such consultations. We are convinced that members of the Security Council would make best use of the opinions of troop contributors.

Much has been said about so-called private meetings between the Security Council and troop contributors, with one such meeting having taken place so far. We believe this discussion format may offer interesting possibilities, and therefore it deserves to be continued.

Improved consultations with troop contributors should help to foster common understanding among all interested partners as to the situation on the ground, a mission's mandate and the risks facing peacekeepers.

Above all, we believe that closer links between troop-contributing countries and the Security Council should strengthen mutual trust and prevent a possible division between those who decide and those who implement.

The President: The next speaker inscribed on my list is the representative of Bulgaria. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Sotirov (Bulgaria): I am pleased to congratulate you, Mr. President, for the remarkable way in which you are performing your duties as President of the Security Council for the month of January at the beginning of the mandate of your country, Singapore, on the Security Council. May I express my confidence that the Council can only benefit from your vast knowledge and experience.

The present open debate on the issue of strengthening cooperation among the Security Council, troop-contributing countries and the Secretariat deserves our full attention and further consideration in the context of the fruitful and constructive debates recently conducted in the Security Council and the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations. We are grateful for the timely and useful background paper submitted by Ambassador Kishore Mahbubani.

We appreciate the way in which today's consultations are being conducted, giving an opportunity to speak first to several non-members of the Security Council. In our view, this innovation has proven itself rewarding in the evaluation process, and it enriches the deliberations in the Council.

Bulgaria associated itself with the statement made this morning by the Permanent Representative of Sweden on behalf of the European Union. My delegation fully subscribes to the positions and proposals he put forward on the improvement of cooperation among the Security Council, troop-contributing countries and the Secretariat. Therefore, I will confine my statement to some observations and comments based mainly on the experience and long-standing participation of my country in United Nations peacekeeping.

Bulgaria is strongly committed to United Nations peacekeeping, which continues to be a unique and indispensable instrument of the international community for the maintenance of international peace and security. Our firm commitment to this core activity of our Organization was further acknowledged last year by the decision of my Government to voluntarily increase its financial contribution to the peacekeeping budget under the scale of assessments recently adopted by the General Assembly. We took this important step recognizing the crucial contribution that enhanced financial resources can make to the credibility and effectiveness of United Nations peacekeeping. In addition, Bulgaria has substantively increased its physical presence in some of the hot spots on the ground. The goal set by the Bulgarian Government of having 100 police officers in United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo and 50 civilian police observers in United Nations Mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina — a threefold increase compared to 1999 — was successfully fulfilled by the end of the year 2000. To meet this goal and to prepare for future participation in peacekeeping operations, additional efforts have been deployed to strengthen the national military and police training capacities and increase the number of personnel available for peacekeeping purposes. In this regard, a possible future contribution of a military contingent has been considered a priority issue by my Government.

In this context, Bulgaria attaches particular importance to further improved cooperation among the Security Council, the Secretariat and troop-contributing countries. We welcomed the report of the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations and endorsed the subsequent conclusions and proposals of the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations on the modalities of cooperation between the Security Council and troop-contributing countries. We believe that this cooperation should further evolve into a transparent, strengthened and more concrete dialogue which continues throughout the entire process of the consideration and formulation of mandates and, later on, during the implementation phase.

Being directly linked to the fundamental question of the formulation of clear, credible and achievable mandates, the consultations must be put on a sound basis to ensure common understanding of the situation on the ground as well as the strategic goals and mandates that might be found appropriate for a particular mission. We welcome, in this regard, Security Council resolution 1327 (2000) as the first step in our common endeavours to explore new ways to enhance the existing system of consultations. The establishment of a new mechanism would enable the

Security Council to have a clearer picture of the resources available for a particular mission while deciding on mandates and strength of personnel. In the same vein, greater transparency during the entire process might encourage the troop-contributing nations to fully meet their commitments. In this context, we commend the determination of Under Secretary-General Jean-Marie Guéhenno to promote permanent dialogue, openness and transparency between the Department of Peacekeeping Operations and troop-contributing nations, including on so-called sensitive issues. We are confident that such an approach would allow for more realistic operational and logistical planning by the Secretariat.

It is my delegation's view that the Security Council activities relating to peacekeeping can only benefit from increased and fruitful cooperation with troop-contributing countries. The expertise and knowledge accumulated by some of these countries in conflict prevention, crisis management, peacekeeping and peace-building might be utilized during all stages of consultations, including the formulation, implementation and termination of or significant changes in the mandates.

Recognizing the primary responsibility of the United Nations for the maintenance of international peace and security, Bulgaria is further contributing to the fulfilment of this goal by playing a key role in a number of initiatives intended to promote the crisis management and peace-building capacities of countries of south-eastern Europe. The Multinational Peace Force for South-Eastern Europe, established in 1998, stands ready for deployment in conflict prevention and other peace-support operations mandated by the United Nations and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe. The headquarters of the Force was activated in August 1999 in Bulgaria and is currently fully operational.

As a troop-contributing country, Bulgaria is looking forward to working closely with all delegations on the important issue of strengthening cooperation among the Security Council, troop-contributing countries and the Secretariat for the achievement of the United Nations objectives in the field of international peace and security.

The President: The next speaker is the representative of Nepal. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Sharma (Nepal): Allow me to congratulate the great people of Singapore, its Government and, personally, you, Mr. President, on Singapore's well-deserved election last fall to the Security Council. It is a happy coincidence that in the very first month of your membership in the Security Council you are presiding over the Council. My delegation particularly appreciates your presence, Mr. Minister, at this open debate.

We welcome other new members of the Security Council and thank the outgoing members for their diligent work on behalf of Member States.

I sincerely thank you, Sir, for selecting such a topical and pertinent theme for the open debate. It is our fervent hope that this debate will, as you have said in your paper,

> "lead to a better relationship between the troop-contributing countries, the Security Council and the Secretariat, and to a new spirit of cooperation among the three partners". (*S/2001/21, annex, para. 8*)

Nepal has always felt, and rather deeply, that the Security Council, troop-contributing countries (TCCs) and the Secretariat should move from the present uneasy symbiosis to a new era of cooperation and partnership. It has been a long-standing necessity for the success of peacekeeping operations. With this conviction, we have always assiduously sought and worked in good faith to enhance cooperation between these actors. We welcome the current willingness of Council members to hear the views of non-members on this issue. This is very encouraging and augurs well for improved dialogue and cooperation.

As a small country, we look to the United Nations as a bulwark of our security. We believe that world peace, under the United Nations initiative and umbrella, is in the common interest of humanity. That is why, since 1975, we have consistently contributed our troops to peacekeeping operations. To date, Nepal has contributed nearly 45,000 troops, and we are currently the eleventh largest troop contributor. Our military personnel and police have helped keep the peace in Asia, Africa and Europe with impeccable professionalism, and 41 of our brave young men have lost their lives in their tour of duty.

Our stake in an improved peacekeeping environment is therefore high. This is the reason why

we relentless seek, as our obligation and as a priority, to strengthen the United Nations peacekeeping capabilities. This was also evidenced by the fact that we joining the consensus last month on creating 95 new posts for the Department of Peacekeeping Operations, in spite of some procedural reservations on our part.

The Council is a prisoner of its past. Its composition perpetuates the global power configuration of 1945. It has failed to move in step with the changing global scene. Some victors of the Second World War have lost ground, and some of the vanquished have gained remarkable political influence or economic strength. Colonies in Asia, Africa and Latin America have gained independence, if not full freedom and equality, in a world dominated by a few, and joined the United Nations. But the Council has remained largely unrepresentative and become only slightly more democratic over the years.

Although the Council is beset with structural, functional and even attitudinal problems, there is still much we can do, without changing the Charter or its structure, to increase cooperation and forge an active partnership between Council members, TCCs and the Secretariat. Improving the performance of peacekeeping operations is critical in order to keep peace in the world, save lives, and prevent mission failures.

The rationale for greater cooperation is overwhelming. For instance, as of 31 December 2000, out of 37,733 troops deployed in various missions, only 6 per cent of the troops came from the permanent members of the Security Council; and the present members of the Council, both permanent and non-permanent, together had 23.8 per cent of the peacekeepers. The rest, a whopping 76.2 per cent, came from non-members.

Over the years, the Council has spelt out several provisions, as contained in its presidential statements of 4 November 1994 and 28 March 1996, for meetings between the Council and the TCCs, but their true spirit has seldom been translated into practice. Often, consultations and the sharing of information between the Council and the TCCs have proved pro forma, perfunctory and ritualistic.

The fundamental problem with those provisions is that they are long on procedure and short on content. More clearly enunciated substantive guidelines are necessary to establish a well-defined modus operandi for sharing information and conducting consultations.

I have found the Permanent Representatives of troop-contributing countries to be a frustrated and unhappy lot. Their capitals consistently ask for regular, substantive briefings on the peacekeeping missions in which their nationals are deployed. What they get from the Council and the Secretariat is the kind of information one can get from newspapers, or even less. If I may ask, does anyone in the Council think that the sort of information and consultation currently apportioned to the troop-contributing countries is sufficient when their troops' lives are at stake?

We ought to bear in mind that, if the Council and the Secretariat extend more cooperation to troop-contributing countries, then they can in turn expect an equally willing quid pro quo from the latter. This would result in a win-win scenario for all.

A successful peacekeeping operation entails a sense of ownership on the part of TCCs, careful cooperation and coordination among the main players, deft management of discords, enhanced understanding and the best possible collective performance in a team spirit.

We do not need to wait for the High-level Working Group to present a package of reforms to act. Security Council reform ought to be seen as a work in progress. We already have a framework laid out by the Council, and Security Council resolution 1327 (2000) reinforces and expands its scope considerably. The report of the Special Committee on Peacekeeping and subsequent General Assembly resolution 55/135 have also marked a step forward.

The Brahimi Panel report is one of the strongest testaments to the imperative need to enhance cooperation between the Council, TCCs and the Secretariat. Its recommendation 64(b) underlines the imperative for consultation with TCCs before the Council adopts a peacekeeping mission-launching resolution and formulates or changes mission mandates, and for substantive briefings.

Ideally, a holistic approach to building partnership calls for a whole m[illegible]y of measures to remove the sharp edges and to forge seamless cooperation between the Council, TCCs and the Secretariat throughout the peacekeeping cycle, from conception to implementation to the winding up of the

mission. Active partnership presupposes a clear head and an open heart, as well as mutual trust among the partners. To preserve the sanctity and vitality of partnership, the rules of the game must be explicitly and adequately spelled out, sincerely respected and meticulously adhered to.

There ought to be a consistent flow of useful information and constant consultations among the partners. Information must be substantive, comprehensive and systematic. Sensitive information ought to be confidentially shared, in an appropriate format, and confined to the partners only, so as not to jeopardize the mission or the peacekeepers' safety and integrity. The best format would be to ensure access by troop-contributing countries to Secretariat briefings to the Security Council.

Consultations need to take place at all stages, before a decision affecting the safety and security of peacekeepers is made. They should be active, specific, interactive and productive, and be carried out in a manner that ensures that TCCs' views and opinions are given thorough and careful consideration when the Council makes its decisions. If the views of TCCs cannot be reflected in a decision, the Council should, to preserve the confidence of TCCs in the process, take pains to explain why.

The existing and the envisaged arrangements, though they largely cover the questions of information and consultation, completely fail to address a number of other principal concerns of the TCCs. These concerns mainly relate to such often-interrelated issues as TCCs' involvement in mission planning and in helping to write the rules of engagement, security backing and exit strategies, and commitment gaps and improved preparedness of TCCs.

Nepal strongly believes that TCCs must be involved right from the start in missions they are to engage in, beginning with mission planning and helping draft the rules of engagement. As we know, differences exist between the cultures, military doctrines, command and control structures and social environments of various TCCs. Bringing TCCs' senior planners to the Secretariat on a short-term basis for mission planning and to help write the rules of engagement helps them bridge the differences and understand each other better. This is vital for the success of a mission.

Security back-up and exit strategies are sure to work wonders, especially to bolster the confidence of small, developing States like Nepal, whose capacity to deal with emergencies is limited. But these elements have always escaped the attention of the Council and the Secretariat. Speaking from our own experience, the safety and security of their personnel is paramount in the minds of troop-contributing countries, even though they are fully aware of the price they may eventually have to pay for peace.

Obviously, not all TCCs' troops are equally trained. Some do not have the luxury of sophisticated weaponry and utmost military preparedness. Not surprisingly, however, parties in conflict, including some non-State actors in a globalized world, may possess more deadly weapons or enjoy greater readiness than peacekeepers from many developing countries and even some developed countries. The confidence that there is security to cover them if the situations deteriorates or if reinforcement is needed, together with exit strategies should they have to be extricated from the conflict areas, would greatly boost the morale of peacekeepers and bring out the best in them. This would also deter the conflicting parties from undermining or overrunning peacekeepers.

These measures also build confidence and motivation for troop-contributing countries to participate in peacekeeping more readily, helping to remove commitment gaps. Gaps in commitment have become a serious problem for troop-contributing countries and the United Nations. Missions like the one in Sierra Leone are facing a shortage of troop commitment from troop-contributing countries. There is an enduring anomaly here. Those who may contribute their troops on a completely self-sustained basis are not pledging their contribution for one reason or another. Those who are contemplating contributing troops do not have the resources to send their troops fully equipped to the mission area. The Council and the Secretariat, therefore, should facilitate cross-matching of troops and equipment to diminish the commitment gaps.

The other element of commitment gaps has to do with lack of preparedness of troop-contributing countries' forces for quick deployment. This particular aspect calls for upgrading the standby arrangements and for ensuring appropriate troop training at national and regional levels. Support from or through the United Nations to troop-contributing countries for earmarking

dedicated troops and imparting necessary training could be effective in building moral commitment and preparedness to contribute troops at relatively short notice.

These are some thoughts that need to be considered in depth and implemented to improve the performance of peacekeeping operations and promote genuine partnership between the Council, the troop-contributing countries and the Secretariat. We echo the proposal that the Security Council should form a subsidiary organ to institutionalize its consultations with troop-contributing countries on a timely and regular basis.

Cooperation cannot be built overnight. We will have to make efforts and invest resources in a coordinated manner to make it happen. At the United Nations we work in a complex environment of clashing priorities, conflicting national interests and shifting turf battles, compounded by national hubris and the bureaucratic labyrinth. This makes cooperation and compromise all the more necessary, and it is not impossible if we consider the greater good of humanity.

The United Nations has helped avoid wars of catastrophic proportions. Now it is faced with new challenges: conflicts within States. Tackling new challenges requires innovative thinking and new tools. This is the time to reflect, accommodate and innovate. TCCs are offering their utmost cooperation. The Council should reciprocate. Working together with open minds and strong hearts we can move away from sketchy information and questionable consultations to an era of constructive cooperation and partnership between these principal actors. Cooperation, understanding, common objectives and a cooperative approach are the key to success. That, to my delegation, is the whole raison d'être of the United Nations.

The President: I shall now make a statement in my capacity as representative of Singapore.

Twelve years ago, on 11 December 1988, the United Nations was awarded a Nobel Peace Prize for peacekeeping. Today it is unlikely that United Nations peacekeeping would qualify for a prize. The bloom is off the rose. A series of disastrous experiences over the past decade, in places like Somalia, Rwanda, Bosnia and Sierra Leone, have clearly indicated that all is not well in the world of peacekeeping.

The good news is that the United Nations has made an honest effort to investigate these failures. There has been much soul-searching on the failures and shortcomings in United Nations peacekeeping operations, particularly on the part of the Secretariat. The ground-breaking reports of the Secretary-General on the fall of Srebrenica, of the Independent Inquiry on the 1994 genocide in Rwanda and of the Assessment Mission on the recent debacle in Sierra Leone all bear testimony to this. The Secretary-General has also built on this by commissioning the report of the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations, better known as the Brahimi report. Some of the Panel's recommendation have already begun to be implemented.

The bad news is that not all the lessons have been fully taken in, either by the Security Council or by the Secretariat. It is shocking that in the year 2000 we should see a recurrence of problems with peacekeeping, despite the lessons of Somalia and Bosnia in the mid-1990s. The unprecedented move by India and Jordan to withdraw their troops from the United Nations Mission in Sierra Leone (UNAMSIL), arising from a lack of consultation by the Security Council with the troop contributors, has served as a wake-up call to all those who are responsible for designing and mandating peacekeeping operations.

This UNAMSIL episode demonstrated one of the core truths we have to face head on: there can be no peacekeeping without peacekeepers. Were the United Nations to lose the confidence of major troop-contributing countries (TCCs), we would be effectively sounding the death knell or signalling the decline of United Nations peacekeeping activities. This is why today it was important for members of the Council to first hear the views of TCCs before responding. The rich dialogue we have had since this morning has confirmed that we have adopted the right format for today's discussions.

We have also heard today a rich menu of suggestions on what can be done to strengthen cooperation with TCCs. Many of these suggestions build on ideas contained in the Brahimi report. As I am the last speaker in this debate, I would like to briefly highlight a few which, in our view, deserve closer study with a view to early implementation.

First, there needs to be conceptual clarity on the relationship between the three parties. This morning, for example, I spoke of the triangular relationship

among the three. This means that all three should have direct links with each other. However, when we heard the concerns of the TCCs this morning, it occurred to us that perhaps the working model of the United Nations is not a triangular relationship but a linear relationship, with the Secretariat in the middle. Following today's debate, we need to be certain that all three partners have a common mental map of the structure of the consultative process: should it be triangular or linear?

Secondly, virtually all speakers agreed that we must develop a culture of communication and consultations at all levels among the Security Council, the Secretariat and the TCCs. Given this high level of agreement on the need for such a culture, why has it not been achieved yet? One recurring theme we heard all morning was that consultations should be a two-way street. This calls for a high degree of openness and timeliness on the part of the Council and the Secretariat in sharing pertinent information with the TCCs, especially if their troops are to be put at any risk by the Council's decisions, while at the same time, listening carefully to the TCCs. It also means a habit of consulting the TCCs before major decisions are made.

Another unresolved question at this morning's discussion was whether TCCs should be consulted only on implementation of a mandate or even before that, on the formulation of the mandates. Article 44 of the Charter, which was mentioned by several TCCs today, states that TCCs should be invited "to participate in the decisions of the Security Council concerning the employment of contingents of that Member's armed forces". Should the TCCs be kept informed and their views sought consistently by the Security Council at all stage of their deliberations on a peacekeeping operation?

Thirdly, among the TCCs, there seemed to be general agreement that the present format of TCC meeting is not functioning well, with the exception of the private meeting held on 4 October on the United Nations Mission in Sierra Leone (UNAMSIL). Indeed, this UNAMSIL meeting can serve as a model for improving the form and substance of private meetings with the TCCs. Clearly, we need to make them more interactive and productive with a view to achieving greater dialogue and cooperation in these meetings. Some guidelines have already been established for TCC meetings. The spirit of these guidelines needs to be realized at the meetings with TCCs.

Fourthly, many countries also felt that there was a need for new mechanisms. Several TCCs referred to paragraph 61 of the Brahimi report, which suggested the institutionalization of consultation with the TCCs through the establishment of ad hoc subsidiary organs of the Council, as provided for in Article 29 of the Charter. Nobody seems to know why this suggestion was not included in the summary of key recommendations. We need to revisit this suggestion.

There could, of course, be many forms for this subsidiary organ. For example, a number of countries suggested a troop contributors' committee for each peacekeeping operation. The United Kingdom has suggested that a Security Council working group on peacekeeping be established, a proposal which was supported by several delegations. In our view, the working group should not replace the Secretariat, but complement the Secretariat in providing the Security Council the best possible advice on peacekeeping matters. The working group should also not add another layer of bureaucracy. Rather, it should add value to the Council's work. Hence, it should have clear, realistic and focused terms of reference.

This proposed working group, or any other body which may be established, will also not replace the current direct meetings between the Security Council and the TCCs on specific peacekeeping operations. Those meetings should continue. However, the working group can enhance the way the Council cooperates with the TCCs. It should serve as a professional bridge to the TCCs, ensuring that the views and inputs as well as the rich experience and expertise of the TCCs are constantly fed to the Council.

Fifthly, another key phrase we heard today was "mutual trust". Whether through the proposed working group on peacekeeping or directly, the Security Council can work in close partnership with the TCCs and the Secretariat to tackle major problems in the peacekeeping arena. The recent commitment gaps in the contribution of troops to United Nations peacekeeping operations can only be resolved jointly by all three partners. The TCCs must be confident in what the Security Council and the Secretariat are doing, and the Council and the Secretariat must be confident that the TCCs can provide the well-trained and well-equipped troops required. In a more practical area, such as the safety and security of United Nations peacekeepers, the Council, the Secretariat and the TCCs would have to cooperate closely to ensure that

there is no gap or contradiction in the necessary policies and measures that need to be put in place. The lives of peacekeepers are at stake each time the Council makes a mistake.

Finally, I would like to call on all parties to help develop a new spirit of cooperation between the TCCs, the Security Council and the Secretariat. We, the Council members, should therefore change our attitude towards the TCCs and view them as partners, not spoilers, in our common goal to improve the effectiveness of peacekeeping operations. With a new spirit of partnership, we may avoid a recurrence of the disasters we saw in the last decade and perhaps pave the way for another global award of excellence for United Nations peacekeeping activities.

Before I resume my function as President of the Council, may I also reiterate a point I made in my introductory remarks this morning. We continue to hope that as a result of the rich exchange of views we have heard today some concrete recommendations will emerge. If these recommendations are accepted, we could then consider whether the Council should formulate a resolution or presidential statement to adopt them.

I now resume my function as President of the Security Council.

Consultations on this issue will continue. The next meeting of the Security Council to continue the consideration of this item on the agenda will be fixed in consultation with members of the Council.

The meeting rose at 6.30 p.m.